

T H E
C A S E
O F

Mr. *John Simson*

Professor of Divinity in the Uni-
versity of *Glasgow*.

Consisting of the Original Papers of the Pro-
cess carried on against Him

B Y

Mr. *JAMES WEBSTER*,

One of the Ministers of the Gospel at
EDINBURGH.

Containing Mr. *WEBSTER*'s Libel,
and Mr. *SIMSON*'s Answers.

Wherein Several Points of Divinity Relating to the
Relagian, Socinian, Arminian and Other Contro-
versies, are Briefly Handled.

Glasgow, Printed for Mr. *Simson*, by *Donald Govan*
Printer to the University. M. DCC. XV.

C A S E

Mr. John Simpson

Professor of Divinity in the University of Glasgow

Against of the Original Papers of the Pro-
cess carried on against him

JAMES WEBSTER

One of the Ministers of the Gospel at
EDINBURGH

Containing I. Webster's Appeal
and Mr. Simpson's Answer.



Printed at the University Press, Glasgow.

Printed by James Macmillan, Glasgow.



Libel Mr. JAMES WEBSTER, *against* Mr. JOHN SIMSON *Professor of Divinity in the University of Glasgow, given in to the very Reverend the Presbytery of Glasgow.*



Orasmuch as, by the Word of GOD, Constitutions of this Church, and Acts of the General Assembly, and Acts of Parliament, It is provided and appointed, that Ministers of the Gospel, and such as have the Inspection and Instruction of Youth, in Colleges and Schools, be sound in the Faith, and Conform themselves to the Word of GOD, and the Confession of Faith of this CHURCH, and teach Nothing contrary thereto Directly nor Indirectly, under the Pains therein mentioned. Yet, true it is, and of Verity, That Mr. JOHN SIMSON Professor of Divinity hath sented these following Errors, and, during the space of the sixth, or fifth, or fourth, or third, or second, or first Year last past, taught them his scholars in his Hall, Namely,

IMO. The End of GOD's Reve'ation towards the Heathens, is not only their Conviction, and the greater Restraining of them, but also that they may seek after further Discoveries of the LORD to themselves; for, the Heathen, by the Light of Nature may know, that GOD is Reconcilable, yea that there is a Remedy provided, tho' they cannot know the particular Way of Salvation, and it is their Duty to seek after the Knowledg of the Way how GOD is Reconciled: And if they would, GOD wou'd discover it to them, and this will be that for which the Heathens chiefly will be Condemned, that tho' they might have known a Remedy was provided, yet they did not seek after the Knowledg of the particular Way of Redemption.

2do. As the SUPRALAPSARIAN Way is intricate, and liable to many Difficulties, so neither is the common ordinary Scheme of the SUBLAPSARIANS so satisfying, as the Creature in Reprobation is considered as a Sinner, so in the Predestination of others to the Illustration of the Glory of Mercy, they are not only considered as miserable Sinners, but also as invested with all those Qualities which make them meet for the Illustration of the Glory of Mercy. Therefore, this Order of the Divine Decrees in Election seems to us more agreeable to Divine Wisdom, viz. IMO. GOD decreed to give to a Number of Mankind Sinners (having also decreed to send his Son into the World for their Redemption) Faith in the LORD JESUS CHRIST, and Repentance towards GOD, and Holiness, begun in Time, and perfected at their Death. Then

2do. They being considered as thus made meet for the Illustration of his Glory and Mercy, He pre-

destinated

destinated them for that very End: And this Order seems to us less liable to the Cavills of Adversaries.

3tio. Our Divines do too boldly determine the Number of the Elect to be fewer than that of the Reprobate, since the Scripture is silent on this Head. The Scriptures adduced by our Author, do not prove his Assertion: Our LORD is speaking in these Places of Adult Persons: And it is certain, that as many, if not more, die in Infancy, as come to the Years of Understanding, and probably these make the Number of the Saved Equal with that of the Damned. If then we speak of what is most probable on this Head, we think it is highly probable, that the Number of the Elect is as great, if not greater then that of the Damned, since no Reason can be given, why more should be Reprobated, to illustrate the Glory of Justice, than Chosen to Illustrate the Glory of Mercy: Yea it seems more agreeable to the Goodness of GOD, that His Mercy should be illustrate in as many as His Justice is. Concerning Infants dying within the Pale of the Visible Church, there is no Difficulty; for, they having received the Seal of God's Covenant, and, when dying in Infancy, having done Nothing on their Part to make void the Covenant of Grace sealed to them, it is more than probable, that they are all saved. Concerning the Infants of Heathens & Infidels, we must judge charitably of them also; for it seems very severe, and gives too great an handle to the Adversaries of Truth, to say, that any poor Infants, who have never sinned in their own Persons, should be eternally punished, especially when we consider that GOD has provided a Remedy for

Sinners, and published the same twice to the World; first to ADAM, afterwards to NOAH and his Family; we think none are excluded from the Benefits of this Covenant, but these who in their own Persons exclude themselves. Hence the Infants even of Infidels may be Baptized, if any Christian undertake to bring them up in the knowledg of the Lord. We do not deny, but GOD may condemn to eternal Death Infants; but if He do so, it is by his Absolute Dominion; yet we doubt, if His Absolute Dominion be exerted this Way, yea the Goodness and Mercy of GOD inclines us to think otherways. If there be any Error here, it is on Charity's Side and not great.

4to. Our Author having shown wherein 'Dei Con-
'curfus doth not consist, he tells us, it lyes in 'Præ-
'vio Immediato Prædeterminanti Impulsu & Motu
'Creaturarum ad operandum: But He doth not
satisfyingly explain it. By his Description, Rati-
tional Creatures are like passive Instruments in the
hand of GOD. And truly, this way of Explaining
it, seems to be inconsistent with the Rational Na-
ture. Therefore, that we may the better under-
stand it, let us observe (1mo) That GOD hath
from all Eternity Infallibly Decreed all the Crea-
tures Actions, both Necessary and Contingent
(2do.) He has Decreed to put the Rational Crea-
ture in such Circumstances, in which being placed
he Acts Certainly, yet Freely, what is Decreed
(3tio) GOD, in the Creation of Man, gives him
such Powers, and doth still conserve them, by which
Man being placed in these Circumstances, doth
freely produce such and such Actions as are De-
creed. We are Speaking now of Humane Action

in General, Not in the way of his Concurring with good Actions in Particular. 'Concurfus then is nothing else, but the LORD's (according to his most wise Decree) putting the Creature in such Circumstances, in which the Creatures being placed, does without any previous or predetermining Influence upon it, freely, yet Infallibly produce the Decreed Effect. And this way the MANICHEAN Error and Cavills of Adversaries are sooner evited.

5to. The Desire of Reward, and the Fear of Punishment may not only be a Motive, as our Author sayeth, but should be the Chief Motive to the Rational Creature in Worshipping the LORD; for, GOD has so formed the Rational Creature, Chiefly to seek its own Good and Happiness; neither from this will follow what our Author says, that so we Worship our selves more then the Creator; for, the LORD holds forth Himself to be Worshipped from this as the Chief Motive.

6to. Our Author speaks of GOD's Dispensation with Adam, as if the LORD had transacted with Adam in the way of a Proper Covenant, which there is Stipulation, Restipulation, and Attipulation. The Scripture goes not before us making this Dispensation a proper Covenant: we read Gen. 2. 17. of a Solemn Command given Adam with a Threatning Annexed, which Implied a Promise of Life, and GOD did, as Sovereign Lawgiver, require Obedience to his Commands; But if any call it a Covenant by reason of the Promise of Life, it must be remembred, that it is a Covenant in an Improper sense, and so the Compilers of our Confession of Faith, use the term Chap. 7th. As to the Relation in which Adam

stood to his Posterity, he was their Publick Natural or Moral Head, but not a Federal Representative: To say that he was their Federal Representative, labours with this Difficulty, viz. How it was agreeable to the Justice of GOD, so to Transact with Adam, when he knew he would not faithfully Act the part of his Posterity? If it be said that a Federal Representation is Necessary, in order to Maintain the Imputation of Adam's first Sin: We Answer, the Imputation of Adam's first Sin follows clearly from his being a Natural or Moral Head; for, Imputation of Sin is nothing else, but the Connexion betwixt the Sin of one and the Punishment or Loss that another sustains by it. So Adam Sinning, he became Corrupt, and so we are descended Corrupt from him: This Original Corruption in us is the Effect of Adam's first Sin, and thus it is Imputed to us, and thus we are to understand the Apostle Rom. 5. 12.

7mo. Our Author's Answer to the Objection of the Pelagians, is, that GOD is not Unjust in Commanding us to Obey tho' we have no Power, because our Impotency is Culpable, and was Voluntarily contracted: But this is not so satisfying. It might be well said to Adam that had lost power to Obey, but that can't be said of us who never had that Power; Adam lost Power by his own default but we never lost it by our fault. Therefore the Justice of GOD in Commanding us to Obey appears evidently, if we consider, He has been pleased to Reveal His Grace, and offers strength to us by the Gospel, and Commands us to ask and we shall receive, and we have Natural powers and abilities to seek the LORD's special and saving Grace which

which if we do, He has promised to give us His Special Saving Grace Matth. 7. 7. GOD may Sovereignly prevent Sinners when they are not seeking Him, but His ordinary way of Communicating His Grace, is in the way of their seeking after it.

8vo. Our Divines, in Explaining the Propagation of Original Sin, say, That GOD in Creating the Soul deprives it of Original Righteousness; first upon the account of Adam's first Sin: But it is hard to understand how it is Agreeable to the LORD's Justice and Goodness, to deal so with the Soul, when as yet it hath Committed nothing deserving such a Sentence: Therefore we think it more safe to say, That the Soul is Created Pure and Holy as Adam's was, but by being United to the Corrupted Body, it contracts wicked habits and Dispositions from it; Neither is it Inconsistent with the Justice of GOD, to unite a Holy Soul to a Corrupt and Depraved Body, since he has provided a Remedy for all who do not Despise and Reject that Remedy.

9no. Our Author says, That Necessity of Eternal Punishment follows from Sin its being an Offence committed against an Infinite Majesty. But this doth not make it Necessary; It rather flows from the Necessity of such a Sanction to the Divine Law: For, such a Punishment must be annexed to the Law, as is sufficient to deter the Creature from violating the Law; and since we know by experience, that the Threatning of Eternal punishment doth not deter Sinners from violating GOD's Law, far less would a lesser Punishment do

it: Hence the threatning of an Eternal punishment is necessary.

10mo. What our Author saith concerning the Continual Multiplying of sins in Hell we cannot approve: Since an Earthly Judge can inflict such a Punishment upon the Despisers of his Laws, as shall put them for ever out of Capacity to violat his Laws in his own Dominions, Much more can the Supreme Judge Inflict such Punishment upon the Despisers of his Laws as shall keep them from Violating the same: And we do not see, how it is agreeable to his Wisdom and Holiness, to punish Sinners for Sins they have done, and yet in the mean time to suffer them to go on in Sinning against him, when it must be owned, Infinite Power can restrain them for ever from Sinning. And therefore, we think, the end of the Punishment is to punish them for Sins committed in time, and to restrain them for ever from Sinning, and in this state they shall be made to acknowledge and to acquiesce in the Justice of GOD in punishing them.

These Errors he taught before these Witnesses, Mrs. WILLIAM HENDERSON in the Presbytery of Dumblane, DAVID STEVENSON in the Presbytery of Stirling, JOHN LOGAN, ROBERT CARRICK and JAMES SEMPLE in the Presbytery of Dumbarton, JAMES LESLIE in Linlithgow Presbytery, WILLIAM WILSON in Dumfermling Presbytery, GILBERT CRAIG in Glasgow Presbytery, WILLIAM DUNLOP in the Presbytery of Edinburgh, Preachers. As likewise before these Students following, Mr. ARCHIBALD CAMPBELL in the Presbytery of Edinburgh, WILLIAM

ment WILLIAM DALGLEISH in Linlithgow Presbytery, JOHN ANDERSON in Glasgow Presbytery, MICHAEL McTAGGAT in Hamilton Presbytery, JOHN CHIESLY in EDINBURGH Presbytery, WILLIAM ANDERSON, JAMES MILLAR. And further Proof of the foresaid Errors I refer to Mr. SIMSON's Letters to Mr ROWAN.

As likewise, the said Mr JOHN SIMSON did, at Conference in Mr KELLO's House Vintner in Edinburgh, before these reverend Ministers (in the Months of June or July or August or September 1713) Mr WILLIAM CARSTAIRS Principal of the College of Edinburgh, Mr WILLIAM WISHEART, JOHN FLINT, McLERAN, WILLIAM MILLAR, JAMES GRIAR Ministers of Edinburgh, Mr JOHN STIRLING Principal of the College of Glasgow, Mr WILLIAM HAMILTON Professor of Divinity at Edinburgh, and Mr JAMES SMITH Minister of the Gospel at Cramond, did assert and declare (1mo) That Adam in the State of Innocence had not a Power of Believing in Christ. (2do) Denied that there was a proper Covenant made between God and Adam. (3tio) That Adam was not a Proper, Federal Representative Head of all Mankind. (4to) That there is not a formal Imputation of Adam's first Sin to his Posterity, only such an Imputation as is often of our immediate Parents Faults to us. i. e. his punishing us for the Faults of our Fathers, tho we do not sin in them or fall with them in their personal sinful Actions. (5to) That all the Children of Pagans, Mahometans, Jews, dying in their Infancy, before their Committing of Actual Sin,

Sin, are saved. (6to) That justifying Faith includes (in its formal Conception and Nature) good Works and Obedience. (7timo) That it is probable the Number of the Saved is as great, if not greater, than that of the Damned. (8vo) That after the last Judgement there shall be no Sinning in Hell. (9no) That there is no Immediat Previous and Physical Concurse of God with Man in all his Actions. (10mo) That there is a certain necessary Connexion betwixt the use of Means, or Moral Seriousness, and Regenerating Grace. (11mo) As also, the said Mr SIMSON doth (in his Letters to the deceased Mr ROBERT ROWAN, late Minister in Penningham, which I refer to for the proof of some of the Errors mentioned in this second Class) assert, that there are two Principles of Divinity, the Scriptures, and our Reason. He likewise (in a Letter to my self, dated Feb. 23. 1713) asserts the foresaid Connexion betwixt the use of Means and obtaining of saving Grace ; And before Mr Harvy Merchant in Glasgow and Robert Strang Merchant there, in the Professor's Chamber, a little before taking the Abjuration, did assert, that we all have a Natural Power and Ability in our selves, to seek saving Grace, which Power if we use, God has promised to give us that Grace ; according to our Saviours Words, whosoever seeks shall find. (12mo) Likewise, before the said Mr Harvie and Robert Strang, at the foresaid time and place, he asserted, that Mans chief End was his own Happiness first, and the Glory of God next ; and further added, that he had maintained the said Opinion before the Presbyterie, and they condemned it

not,

Against Mr. Simson.

21

not, which they would have done, if they had not been of his Mind.

And therefore, it is hereby craved, that the said Mr JOHN SIMSON may be Summoned by Order of the Presbytery of Glasgow, where he resides, to Answer for venting the abovemention'd Errors in Doctrine, and that the Witnesses, contained in the List hereto subjoined, be cited, to declare upon Oath, what they know in the premisses, and upon the said Mr JOHN SIMSON his being Convicted of all the above Errors, or of such of them as shall infer Censure, either by his own Acknowledgement, or the Depositions of Witnesses, he be Censured according to the merit of the Crimes, and Acts of General Assemblies. This Libel I have subscribed at Edinburgh, the twenty seventh of September, One thousand seven hundered and fourteen Years, before Mr JOHN SHAW Minister of South-Leith, and GEORGE BRYSON Merchant in Edinburgh. Sic subscribitur JAMES WEBSTER. JOHN SHAW Witness: GEORGE BRYSON Witness.

A List of Witnesses.

Mr Simsons Schollars, now Preachers of the Gospel.

Mrs William Henderson in the Presbytery of *Dumblane.*

David Stevenson in the Presbytery of *Stirling.*

John

Sin, are saved. (6to) That justifying Faith includes (in its formal Conception and Nature) good Works and Obedience. (7timo) That it is probable the Number of the Saved is as great, if not greater, than that of the Damned. (8vo) That after the last Judgement there shall be no Sinning in Hell. (9no) That there is no Immediat Previous and Physical Concourse of God with Man in all his Actions. (10mo) That there is a certain necessary Connexion betwixt the use of Means, or Moral Seriousness, and Regenerating Grace. (11mo) As also, the said Mr SIMSON doth (in his Letters to the deceased Mr ROBERT ROWAN, late Minister in Penningham, which I refer to for the proof of some of the Errors mentioned in this second Class) assert, that there are two Principles of Divinity, the Scriptures, and our Reason. He likewise (in a Letter to my self, dated Feb. 23. 1713) asserts the foresaid Connexion betwixt the use of Means and obtaining of saving Grace ; And before Mr Harvy Merchant in Glasgow and Robert Strang Merchant there, in the Professor's Chamber, a little before taking the Abjuration, did assert, that we all have a Natural Power and Ability in our selves, to seek saving Grace, which Power if we use, God has promised to give us that Grace ; according to our Saviours Words, whosoever seeks shall find. (12mo) Likewise, before the said Mr Harvie and Robert Strang, at the foresaid time and place, he asserted, that Mans chief End was his own Happiness first, and the Glory of God next ; and further added, that he had maintained the said Opinion before the Presbyterie, and they condemned it

not,

Against Mr. Simson.

21

not, which they would have done, if they had not been of his Mind.

And therefore, it is hereby craved, that the said Mr JOHN SIMSON may be Summoned by Order of the Presbytery of Glasgow, where he resides, to Answer for venting the abovemention'd Errors in Doctrine, and that the Witnesses, contained in the List hereto subjoined, be cited, to declare upon Oath, what they know in the premisses, and upon the said Mr JOHN SIMSON his being Convicted of all the above Errors, or of such of them as shall infer Censure, either by his own Acknowledgement, or the Depositions of Witnesses, he be Censured according to the merit of the Crimes, and Acts of General Assemblies. This Libel I have subscribed at Edinburgh, the twenty seventh of September, One thousand seven hundered and fourteen Years, before Mr JOHN SHAW Minister of South-Leith, and GEORGE BRYSON Merchant in Edinburgh. Sic subscribitur JAMES WEBSTER. JOHN SHAW Witness: GEORGE BRYSON Witness.

A List of Witnesses.

Mr Simsons Schollars, now Preachers of the Gospel.

Mrs William Henderson in the Presbytery of *Dumblane.*

David Stevenson in the Presbytery of *Stirling.*

John

John Logan

Robert Carrick

James Semple.

James Lesly in Linlithgow

William Wilson in Dumfermling Presby-
(tery

Gilbert Craig in Glasgow Presbytery.

William Dunlop in Edinburgh Presb.

Students in the following.

Mrs *Archbald Campbel in Edinburgh Presb.*

William Dalgleish in Linlithgow Presb.

John Anderson in Glasgow Presbytery.

Michael Mactaggat in Hamilton Presb.

*John Chiesly, Wil'iam Anderson, James
Millar, Thomas Harvie.*

Mr William Hamilton in Glasgow.

Ministers who were Witnesses to the Conference at *Edinburgh.*

The Reverend *Mr William Carstairs* Principal of the College there.

Mr John Flint

Mr John Maccleran

Mr James Griar

Mr William Millar

Mr William Visheart Ministers there.

Mr John Stirling Principal of the College of *Glasgow.*

Mr William Hamilton Professor of the College of *Edinburgh.*

Mr James Smith Minister of *Cramond*

Mr

Mr John Simson Professor of Divinity, his Letters to Mr Rowan.

An Additional Libel given in to the very Reverend Presbytery of Glasgow, by Mr. JAMES WEBSTER, against Mr. JOHN SIMSON Professor of Divinity in the University of Glasgow.

No. 1mo. The said Mr SIMSON asserted, that 'Evangelium promulgatum est omni & toti humano Generi ubicunque, magis implicate vel explicite, ita ut possint obtinere Salutem æternam, si velint uti ista Cognitione debito modo, si orarent DEUM, obtinerent Misericordiam; licet non eo Modo quo nos eam consequimur.

2do. 'CHRISTUS est causa Electionis ex merito suo, quoad Electionem in genere; non tamen differentia quod hic magis quam alius eligatur.

3tio. 'Nullus datur DEI Concurfus physicus in Actionibus malis Hominum, Vires naturales sufficiunt ad eas producendas. This is a further Enlargement of the fourth Article of the first Libel.

4to. "Unica Anima humana potest informare diversa & diffita corpora humana, & omnes vitales & rationales Actiones in ijs præstare: Et hac similitudine utitur ad explicandum Mysterium Trinitatis.

5to. 'Duplex datur Justificatio Electorum, prima est per Fidem in Christum, ultima vero in ultimo Judicio erit ex bonis operibus, non tamen ex merito.

6to,

14 *Mr. Webster's Additional Libel*

6to. When He was treating on CHRIST's Imputed Righteousness, He never asserted, that it was a formal Imputation of the Righteousness, it self in the Sense that all Orthodox Divines explain it, and wished, that our Divines, writing on this Subject, had not, or did not favour the Antinomian Error.

7mo. There is no Place of Scripture that asserts the Procession of the HOLY GHOST from the Son. The Scripture says, that he was sent from the Son and did proceed from the Father; so that, the Greek Church is not to be too much condemned on this Head.

8vo. 'Magistratus Christianus habet plenam Potestatem Indicendi Synodos, Dies Jejunij, Gratiarum Actionis, non tamen solam: Ecclesia, Magistratui ei inimico, vel renitente, potest ea indicere non autem publice peragere, sed privato modo vel clandestino, si modo prudenter agat.

9no. 'Ejus Sanguinis sub novo Testamento esse illicitus.

10mo. 'Mundos esse in Luna & reliquis Planetis, qui possidentur ab Animalibus Rationalibus, valde probabile est.

11mo. When He commented upon MARCKII Medulla, He was not satisfied with confuting of Him, but treated Him rudely, for keeping the Orthodox Road, in defending Protestant Principles, having this Expression several Times in His Mouth "Hallucinatur Author, tho' it is well known that MARCKIUS is a very Orthodox Divine, and in managing matters brought in the common Topicks in Confirmation of his Doctrine, and I know no Errors in MARCKIUS which relate meerly to Doctrinal

Crinal Articles. I know, he is unsound in point of Church Government, and the use of Organs in publick Worship.

12. In Answering the Objection against the Imputation of ADAM's first Sin and Propagation of Original Sin, even in his way of Explaining them (which Objection is, That it is inconsistent with the Goodness and Righteousness of GOD) In his Answer, I say, He tells us, That to preserve GOD's Goodness and Righteousness, GOD would have hindred the Propagation of Mankind, or else behoved to provide such a Remedy for all and every one of Mankind, as that none of them should go to Hell (meerly and only) for ADAM's first Sin, or Original Pollution and Corruption, and that they who perish, shall perish, because they themselves commit Actual Sin; which, he thinks, is the way to save the Attributes of GOD. This twelfth Error is in his Letter to Mr. ROWAN.

13. He doth not own the formal Imputation of Christs Active Righteousness, but said before ROBERT STRANG and WILLIAM HARVIE Merchants in Glasgow, a little before the Ministers making the Abjuration, in his own Chamber, that making Christs Active Obedience the Object of justifying Faith, runs us into Antinomianism.

These forementioned Errors were taught by Mr. SIMSON to his Schollars (in his School) mentioned formerly in the first Libel within the fore-said space of Time specified in the said Libel, and for further Proof of several of these Errors, I refer to his own Letters to Mr. ROBERT ROWAN and the Deposition of HARVIE and STRANG. And therefore it is hereby craved that the said

Mr

Mr. JOHN SIMSON be Summoned by Order of the Presbytery, to Answer for Venting the abovementioned Errors, and that the Witnesses contained in the former Libel, may be Cited, to Declare upon Oath, what they know in the Premises, as also Mrs. HARVIE and STRANG; and upon the said Mr. JOHN SIMSON his being Convicted of the above Errors by his own Acknowledgement, or the Deposition of Witnesses, he be Censured according to the Merit of the Cause. This I have subscribed at GLASGOW, the twenty ninth of September, seventeen hundred and fourteen, before these Witnesses, WILLIAM CARLYLE Merchant in GLASGOW, and JOHN CRAIG, Sugar Baker in the Wester Sugarie. Sic subscribitur, JAMES WEBSTER. WILLIAM CARLYLE Witness. JOHN CRAIG Witness.

And besides the Witnesses in the forementioned Libel, there is to be Cited Mr. HARVIE and Mr. STRANG.

Having omitted to Insert in the Body of this Libel, to Charge the Professor with a Plain and Dreadfull Innuendo, that our Confession and Catechisms contradict one another, I do now Charge him with it: As likewise Charge him with giving such Reasons for their Clashing as mightily Reflect on the Grave and Reverend Assembly who Composed them both. This Written and Subscribed by Me the 29th of Septemb. 1714. at Glasgow, Sic Subscrib.

JAMES WEBSTER.

Witness his Letters to Mr. Rowan.

A Representation of the Inconsistency of the Errors in My first *Libel* against Professor *Simson*, with the *Scriptures Confession of Faith*, *Catechisms Larger and Shorter*, and with the Writings of *Orthodox Divines*.

THE first Error containeth several Propositions which cannot be proven by Scripture, or by good, and necessary Consequences deduced from them, and are therefore Contrary to the Confession of Faith, Cap. 1. §. 2. And Contrary to the Answer to the second Question of the Larger Catechism.

In the first Proposition mentioned in the first Error, namely, That the End of GOD's Revelation toward the Heathens is not only their Conviction &c. But that they may seek after further Discoveries of the LORD; Which he Explaining says, is to seek after the way how GOD is Reconciled, and what is the Remedy GOD has provided for Reconciling of us; This agreeth not with the Confession Chap. 1. §. 1. which mentions GOD's Ends of Natural Revelation to the Heathens without the least Innuendo of the Ends the Professor gives: Yea, the Section holds forth, that because the Heathens have not the sufficient Knowledge of GOD and of His Will, which is necessary unto Salvation, Therefore it pleased the LORD to Reveal Himself, and Declare that His Will unto His Church. Acts 17. 27. quoted by Universalists; will not favour him, as will appear by consulting our

B

Polémical

18. *Mr. Webster's Represent.* Part I. Er. 1.

Polemical Divines upon that place. The Professor likewise saith, that by the Light of Nature Heathens may know that GOD is Reconcilable, But I ask him, How is GOD Reconcilable, to all the Heathen Nations, without CHRIST had satisfied Justice for them? Is not this Universal Redemption? The Professor further saith, That there is a Remedy provided, and that they know it is so; And in the first Error of the Second Lybel, He is charged with saying, that the Heathen have the Gospel some Way promulgat to them. This is not in Scripture expressly or by Consequences: It's contrair to the Confession of Faith CHAP. 7. §. 5, 6. in the Beginning, Contrair to the Scriptural Character of the Heathens, and Scriptural Account of their State: They are said to be ATHE-OL, without GOD, or ATHEISTS, Strangers to the Covenant of Promise, without Hope &c. and Darknes in the very Abstract. I need not quote TURRET. System. Part 2. Pag. 209. asserting the Covenant of Grace to be Unknown to the Heathen World: Nor CORVINE the Armin. Against TILEN. Chap. 3. who speaks the Sentiments of the Professor: CORVIN's Words are these, the Gentile World were not altogether excluded from the Covenant of Grace, because (adds He) aliquo ' saltem modo vocantur ut DEUM quærant. But further, how can we know without a particular Revelation from GOD, that there is a Remedy provided, seeing the providing of a Remedy, is an Act of his Free-will; which Without a supernatural Revelation we can never know. Further, the Professor sayeth, if the Heathen would seek after the Knowledg of the Way how GOD is reconciled

ciled, He would discover it unto them. I answer, if this be true, then the making known the Remedy to some Heathen Nations, and not to others, may be, because the One sought after the Way, and the Other did it not. Against this RUTHERFORD in his Exam. Armin. P. 446, 447, 448; solidly argues from the Scriptures.

The second ERROR.

THis New Scheme and Model of Election is contrary to Acts 13. 48. 'As many' believed, as were ordained to Eternal Life; which is quoted by Orthodox Divines, to prove against ARMINIANS, that Election to Life; in the order of GOD's Decrees, is before Faith, and that Faith is the Fruit of Election: And is contrary to the Confession of Faith CHAP. 3. §. 5. Initio, and to Parag. 6. contrary to the Synod of DORT, Article 1. §. 9. Art. 3. and 4. §. 3. 10. 12. Electio (says the Synod) Fons est 'omnis salutiferi Boni ex qua Fides, Sanctitas, & alia salutifera Dona fluunt, atque in hac non respexit DEUS ullas Qualitates, Conditiones, aut Opera Hominis.

This New Ranging of the Decrees by the Professor, carries great Danger along with it, because He owns in his Letter to me, that if we use the Means, we shall obtain regenerating Grace. The Decree of giving regenerating Grace to the most of People, according to him, is upon GOD's Fore-sight of their using the Means, when others do not. His New Model of Predestination, makes Persons who are foreseen to Believe, Repent, be Holy, &c.

to be the Object of Election; how far this is contrary to the whole Current of Scripture and Orthodox Divines, the Reverend Presbytry may judge: And from his Scheme, and from what is just now quoted from his Letter to me, it follows as a very natural and clear Consequence, that the Reason why One gets Regenerating Grace and believes; and consequently, why one is saved, and Another gets not that Faith and Salvation, the Reason I say is, the One used the Means and the Other did not. This, according to him, must be the Reason, why the most of People obtain Regenerating Grace when others do not obtain it. For He holds this to be GOD's Common and Ordinary Way in the most of Peoples obtaining of Grace: This is contrary to Scripture, resolving the Difference among Men to GOD's Free-will.

I do not understand what Room and Place CHRIST and His Merit hath in this new Scheme; for GOD's sending of Christ to the World for our Redemption comes, in the Professors Order of Decrees, as a *Propositio Incidens*. Elsewhere, viz. in the second Libel, He makes CHRIST to be the *Causa Electionis in genere*, i. e. (as I understand it) that Christ and his Merit is the Cause why GOD chooses at all any Persons, and that the Decree of sending of CHRIST to redeem, must, *Prioritate Naturæ*, preceed his Decree of Election; This is contrary to John 3. 16. which makes electing Love to be the Cause of sending of CHRIST. RUTHERF. Exam. Armin. P. 164 argues from Scripture against Arminians, asserting that Christ is the meritorious Cause of Election, and proves from several Scriptures by him quoted, particular-

ly

by 1 Thess. 5. 9. Ephes. 1. 5. that the Decree of Election goes before the Decree of sending of CHRIST. This Assertion of the Professor is contrary to the Confession of Faith CHAP. 3. §. 6. which makes Election first, and then posterior to that, is, His fore-ordaining the Means thereunto; and of these Means, Redemption by CHRIST is reckoned one, and TURRET Par. 1. P, 386. Loc. 4. Quæst. 10. De Electionis Causa, an Christus sit causa & Fundamentum Electionis? Neg. contra Armin. where He solidly confutes the Error of the Professor and ARMINIANS.

ERROR 3d.

THE Professor Arraigneth all Orthodox Divines, for their bold asserting, the Number of the Elect to be fewer than that of the Reprobate. Yet I desire him to give me any kind of Argument from Gods Word for the contrary Opinion which he maintains. This his Error contradicts the Scriptures, which tells the Elect are a little Flock, that few are chosen. Which, and the like Scriptures the Professor expoundeth of ADULTI contrary to the current Exposition of Orthodox Divines. To support this Error, he advanceth several other Errors, as 1st, He makes the Covenant of Grace even as to its great and distinguishing Blessings, Deliverance from Hell, and giving of Heaven, to belong to all baptized Infants, who die in their Infancy without actual Sin, and makes Baptism to seal those Blessings, tho' its certain, the most of them are Children of unconverted Parents. For even according to the Professor, few

22 *Mr. Webster's Represent.* Part I. Er. 3.

ADULTI are chosen. This Assertion of his, concerning all Infants, hath not the least Countenance from Scripture. 2do. He makes Christ the Universal Remedy, provided for Jews, Mahumedans and Pagans, and the Covenant of Grace to extend to them, and include them (which is the Sentiment of Arminians, Apol. Remon. Fol. 87 &c.) 3tio, So far Universal is the Redemption and Covenant of Grace, according to the Professor, that none shall want the distinguishing Blessings of them; who do not by actual Sinnings exclude themselves. This is contrary to the Confession of Faith. Cap. 7. §. 5. 6. Wherein are mentioned two different Administrations of the Covenant of Grace; and both these Administrations limited to the Church. The Professors Assertion of the Salvation of all Infants dying such, is contrary to the Confession, Chap. 10. §. 3. His saying that none go to Hell meerly for Original Sin, is gross ARMINIANISM, condemned by Orthodox Divines; and its Grossness further yet appears, in regard he thinks Punishing in Hell for Original Sin only, cannot be reconciled to the Goodness and Justice of God. See his Letters to Mr. ROWAN, where he likewise asserteth, that God, that he might not be Unjust or Cruel for executing the Sanction of the Covenant of Works, he was obliged of necessity to make a Covenant of Grace; & according to what he says on the Error we are now refuting, the Covenant of Grace, which he was obliged to make, is of so Universal an Extent, as that none are excluded from the Benefits of this Covenant, but these who exclude themselves. I remember that our learned

and

and holy RUTHERFORD, in his Exam. P. 427. 428. &c. Proving that God of his own good Will and Pleasure only, and not from any necessity, did make the Covenant of Grace (and the very Designation GRACE speaks so much) RUTHERFORD condemns the ARMINIANS, for saying, GOD could not justly condemn Men for ADAM's Sin, and what by Divines is called Original Sin. This Error of the Professor and the ARMINIANS, is a great Imputation on the Wisdom and Justice of GOD, in annexing such a Sanction to his Law, as he could not execute, without doing Injury to his Justice and Goodness. It is likewise contrary to our Confession of Faith and Catechisms, which assert the Sinfulness and Misery of our State to follow (JUSTLY) our first Fall; And contrary to all Divines, who make the Object of that part of Reprobation, called Preterition, to be Man considered as Fallen in ADAM.

This Doctrine of the Professor is what the ARMINIANS teach, Apol. Remon. Cap. 7. Fol. 87. Scrip. Synod. Art. P. 145. As likewise the Professor telleth us, that this Remedy GOD has provided, he hath published it twice to the World, first to ADAM, and then to NOAH; the very Assertion of ARMINIANS: And that it is so UNIVERSAL, that None are Excluded from the Benefits, but such as Exclude themselves. I observe, that the Professor's Notion of the Two Covenants is the Reverse of the Sentiments of Orthodox Divines. They Assert the Extent of the Covenant of Works to all Mankind; He Denies there is any such Covenant (properly so taken) with Mankind. They Assert, that the Covenant of Grace is not made

24 *Mr. Webster's Represent. Part I. Er. 4.*
with TURKS, JEWS and PAGANS; He Asserts that it is made with them.

And pursuant of this Universal Covenant of Grace, he saith, that the Children of Infidels may be Baptized, contra Confess. Chap. 28. §. 1. And to the Larger Catechism, in the Answer, To whom is Baptism to be Administred? and to the Definition of a Sacrament in the Larger Catechism, and to the Definition of Baptism there. If the Professor say That Infants belong to the Visible Church, This is Contrary to the Definition of a Visible Church Confess. Chap. 25. §. 2. and to the Definition of a Visible Church in the Larger Catechism.

ERROR 4th.

HERE The Professor Denieth GOD's Immediate, Physical and Previous Concourse in Human Actions in General; and says that it makes us passive Instruments in GOD's Hand, and that it Appears to him to be inconsistent with the Rational Nature. This is Contrary to the Confess. Chap. 5. §. 4. which extends GOD's Active Providence to the Sins of Men. The Scriptures brought by the Assembly to prove this Providence, makes it Manifest, That, by the Providence extending to Mens Sins, they understand this Previous, Physical Concourse in sinful Actions. The Scriptures quoted are 2 Sam. 24. 1. The anger of the LORD was Kindled against Israel, and he Moved DAVID against them to say, go Number Israel and 1 King. 22. 22. 23. And further, they oppose this Providence to the bare Permission of ARMINIANS and JESUITS, and say the Providence

ence is a Governing of Sinful Actions, and quote
 Mai. 10. 6. 7. --- 12. And indeed, the Scriptures
 furnish us with a great many Arguments for this
 Concurse in Sinful Actions: Sometimes GOD is
 said to Blind, Harden, to Give up to strong De-
 lusions, and to Turn the Enemies Heart to hate
 his People; and by the Deprecations of DAVID
 Psal. 119. GOD in a Holy Way, may Physically
 incline us to the Physical Entity and Substract
 Act of Covetousness, and the Sinful Actions of Men
 are called his Actions. Yea, the Universal Physical,
 Previous Concurse seems to have been known to
 some Heathens by the very Light of Nature; for,
 one of them is quoted by the Apostle, as saying,
 'In GOD we Live and Move and have our Being.
 This all our Divines maintain in their Systems and
 Polemics, against ARMINIANS and JESUITS.
 This a great Body of the Sounder PAPISTS,
 DOMINICANS and JANSENISTS do solidly
 Demonstrate: And Indeed, the Contrary Error is
 of Dangerous Consequence; for, without the fore-
 said Concurse, The Dominion of GOD over Mens
 free Actions must be Denied, and likewise His
 Prescience of free Actions; except we say, That
 the Eternal Decree concerning them, comes in
 Room of the Transient, Physical Operation. This
 Doctrine of Physical Concurse, when believed, hath
 a mighty Influence upon the practice of Piety in
 its several Branches, which the Orthodox Defenders
 of the Concurse have made evident. Neither doth
 it make us Passive Instruments, nor is it unsuit-
 able to our Rational Nature, as the Professor fan-
 cieth. For, this Concurse, he must own to be
 Necessary to Gracious Actions: See Confess. Cap.

26 *Mr. Webster's Represent. Part I. Er. 5.*
16. 1. 3. See Psal. 119. Psal. 110. 3. Ezek. 36.
Song. 1. 4. Joh. 6. Phil. 2. 12, 13. Ephes. 1. 19, 20.

The Professor seems by this Error, to embrace the Gross Error of DURANDUS and LUDOVICUS a DOLA, who deny all Concurse of GOD with Mens Actions, and own only a giving Men Faculties and Powers of Acting, and Conserving these Powers. The Professor's placing Men in such Circumstances, which, together with the Decree, produce such Actions infallibly, is, what I cannot comprehend: For, either he must make GOD's Immanent and Eternal Actions supply the Room of Transient Actions, and be the Efficient Cause of all our Actions; or else, he must resolve the Infallible Event of our free Action, into his placing us, in such and such Circumstances; which is too near of Kin to the JESUIT's and ARMINIAN's SCIENTIA MEDIA. I Conclude with a Confession of My Faith on this point, That GOD's Providence about Sin is Effective of the Entity, Permissive of the Malitia, Decretive of the Event, and Ordinate of the whole.

ERROR 5th.

THE Desire of Reward, and the Fear of Punishment, may not only be a Motive, as Our Author MARCKIUS saith, but should be the Chief Motive to the Rational Creature in Worshipping the LORD; for GOD has so formed the Rational Creature, as Chiefly to seek its own Good and Happiness. This is Contrary to the Answer of the first Question of the Catechism. For, as it makes a Complex End of our Actions,
GOD's

GOD's Glory and our Happiness; So it gives the preference to GOD's Glory: Scriptures quoted are Rom. 11. 36. 'For of him, and to him, &c. are all things. The Apostle advanceth good Solid Metaphysicks, That GOD, who is the Author and Efficient Cause, should be Eyed by us as our Chiefest End, and the Ultimate End of all Things. It carries the highest Congruity to Sanctified Reason, yea to Common Sense, That we, owing all we are, all we have, all we can do, all we look at, or hope for, to his Exuberant Goodness; should direct all chiefly to Him. 1 Cor. 10. 31. and 1 Cor. 6. 20. And indeed, according to the Professor, we are obliged to, and Cannot but love our selves better than GOD, contrary to the Sum of the Ten Commandments; For, Loving our own Happiness, is Loving our Selves, and it is the very same thing with it. I know, that some make the Glorifying of GOD, and our Enjoyment of Him, to be one thing: But sure, they are two distinct things, and of distinct Considerations, & in some Cases are separable; For, Our LORD JESUS Glorified GOD in a most supereminent Manner, when he was in all Circumstances of extream Misery, and Suffering the Pains of Hell in a most intense Degree: And the Answer of the Catechism, our own Happiness, should, next to GOD's Glory, be our chief End, which MARCKIUS denyeth not, makes them two distinct things. Did not MOSES and PAUL in their Self-denying wishes, have a greater regard to the Glory of GOD, than to their own Happiness? To which of the Saints will the Professor turn, as of the same selfish Sentiments with himself? Dare any of them say, as he said to some of

28 *Mr. Webster's Represent. Part I. Er. 5.*
of the Witnesſes, That, were it not for the Proſpect of Happineſs, he would not ſerve GOD? What tho' GOD encourages us to ſerve him by Rewards and Punishments, wrapt up in Promiſes and Threatnings, which working on our Hopes and Fears, are Spurs to our Duty, and have a mighty Influence on our Obedience; will this ever interfere, that our Deliverance from Hell, and our Happineſs in Heaven, ſhould be more eyed than GOD's Honour? Sure, he's a mercenary Servant who performs his Task more from a Proſpect of the Wages, and Fear of the Whip, than from Love to his Maſter's Honour, and Reſpect to his Commands. But further, GOD's Glory is throughout the whole Scriptures held forth as his chief End, and preferred by him before our Happineſs; And our bleſſed LORD falls in with this great Deſign, in all his Actings and Sufferings, who, tho' he had in his Eye the Joy ſet before him, yet ſure his Father's Glory was more eyed than his own Joy: And I humbly judge, that our Conformity unto GOD and his Son, in making his chief End to be ours, by eyeing it more than our own Happineſs, is a bright Part of the Divine Image in us. I ſha'll never go in to the Profeſſor's Thoughts, that GOD created a whole World of Intellectual Beings of ſuch a Frame and Make, as that they level all their Thoughts, Words and Actions more to themſelves, as their chiefeſt Mark, than for the Honour of GOD, and ſhould, and muſt do ſo, and muſt chiefly ſeek their own Happineſs, and more than GOD's Glory; And tho' I condemn the Flights of the Myſtick Divines and ANTINOMIANS, who ſtand up for ſuch a diſinterreſted ſerving of GOD, as the

Scripture

Er. 6. *Against Mr Simson.* 29

scriptures doth not allow; And tho' I can't
think that Woman guilty of Undiscretion TIL-
LOTSON makes mention of, who running about
the Streets with a Vessel full of Fire in one Hand,
and a Vessel of Water in the other, cryed out, I'm
going to burn Heaven and quench Hell, that hence-
forth, Men may not serve God, from Hope of Heaven,
or fear of Hell, but meerly from Love to himself; I
shall never go to the left Hand Extream with the
Professor; For I never read or heard of any Di-
vine, who, when describing good Works, made
Love to our own Happiness, more than to
GOD's Glory, an essential Ingredient in them.
And no wonder they never did so, for if Men be
Wise and Holy in their Actions and Aims, they
will always have the greatest Regard to the grea-
test Good: And GOD's Glory Manifestative,
tho' it adds no Happiness to him, yet it is the
greater Good.

ERROR 6th.

THE Professor denies, that GOD made a
proper Covenant with ADAM, and
with us in him; and denies, that he was
our Federal Representative Head; and, in his Let-
ters to Mr. ROWAN, says, Adam's Sin may be
Imputed to us, without any such Covenant; And
on this 6th Error, He advanceth an odd Notion,
concerning the Nature and Imputation of Sin.

His Denying a proper Covenant to have been
made with Adam for himself and us, is contrair
to our Confession Chap. 7. § 2. and contrary to
the Larger Catechism, answering the Question,
Did

28 *Mr. Webster's Represent. Part I. Er. 5.*
of the Witnesses, That, were it not for the Pros-
pect of Happiness, he would not serve GOD? What
tho' GOD encourages us to serve him by Rewards
and Punishments, wrapt up in Promises and
Threatnings, which working on our Hopes and
Fears, are Spurs to our Duty, and have a might-
ty Influence on our Obedience; will this ever in-
fer, that our Deliverance from Hell, and our
Happiness in Heaven, should be more eyed than
GOD's Honour? Sure, he's a mercenary Servant
who performs his Task more from a Prospect of the
Wages, and Fear of the Whip, then from Love
to his Master's Honour, and Respect to his Com-
mands. But further, GOD's Glory is throughout
the whole Scriptures held forth as his chief End,
and preferred by him before our Happiness; And
our blessed LORD falls in with this great Design, in
all his Actings and Sufferings, who, tho' he had in
his Eye the Joy set before him, yet sure his Fa-
ther's Glory was more eyed than his own Joy: And
I humbly judge, that our Conformity unto GOD and
his Son, in making his chief End to be ours, by
eyeing it more than our own Happiness, is a bright
Part of the Divine Image in us. I sha'll never go
in to the Professor's Thoughts, that GOD created
a whole World of Intellectual Beings of such a
Frame and Make, as that they level all their
Thoughts, Words and Actions more to themselves,
as their chiefest Mark, than for the Honour of
GOD, and should, and must do so, and must
chiefly seek their own Happiness, and more than
GOD's Glory: And tho' I condemn the Flights of the
Mystick Divines and ANTINOMIANS, who stand
up for such a disinterested serving of GOD, as the
Scrip-

Er. 6. *Against Mr Simson.* 29

Scriptures doth not allow; And tho' I can't
but think that Woman guilty of Undiscretion TIL-
LOTSON makes mention of, who running about
the Streets with a Vessel full of Fire in one Hand,
and a Vessel of Water in the other, cryed out, I'm
going to burn Heaven and quench Hell, that hence-
forth, Men may not serve God, from Hope of Heaven,
or fear of Hell, but meerly from Love to himself; I
shall never go to the left Hand Extream with the
Professor; For I never read or heard of any Di-
vine, who, when describing good Works, made
Love to our own Happiness, more than to
GOD's Glory, an essential Ingredient in them.
And no wonder they never did so, for if Men be
Wise and Holy in their Actions and Aims, they
will always have the greatest Regard to the grea-
test Good: And GOD's Glory Manifestative,
tho' it adds no Happiness to him, yet it is the
greater Good.

ERROR 6th.

THE Professor denies, that GOD made a
proper Covenant with ADAM, and
with us in him; and denies, that he was
our Federal Representative Head; and, in his Let-
ters to Mr. ROWAN, says, Adam's Sin may be
Imputed to us, without any such Covenant; And
on this 6th Error, He advanceth an odd Notion,
concerning the Nature and Imputation of Sin.

His Denying a proper Covenant to have been
made with Adam for himself and us, is contrair
to our Confession Chap. 7. § 2. and contrary to
the Larger Catechism, answering the Question,
Did

30 *Mr. Webster's Represent. Part I. Er.*

Did all Mankind fall in ADAM's first Transgression? And to the very next Question, and to the two Questions following, what is the Sinfulness and Misery of that Estate whereinto Man fell. In these Places quoted, we have asserted a proper Covenant made with Adam and us, whereby, when He sinned, we are said to sin and fall with him in that first Transgression, and by this our Fall we come under the Guilt of the first Transgression, and by Reason of our sinning in him, we come to have Corruption derived down to us as the Effect of our sinning in Adam, and of GOD's legal Imputing it to us. Now, the Professor denies all this, and makes our being corrupted, by our Descent from Adam, our Natural Head, to be the Effect of Adam's first Sin, by the Laws of Generation, and not as the Effect of our sinning in Adam, and breaking a proper Covenant made with him and us, and this is all the Imputation that the Professor owns: This contrary to Rom. 5. from 12. to 20. which I desire may be read, because it is quoted by the Assembly for the Proof of the Answer made to the Question, Did all Mankind fall in ADAM's first Transgression? Now 'tis manifest from this Scripture, that the Apostle proves an Imputation of CHRIST's Righteousness it self, by the Imputation of Adams Sin it self to his Posterity; so that the whole Effect and Force of the Apostles Discourse and arguing is taken away, if the Imputation of the very first Sin of Adam is denied; and there is no possible Way of explaining that long Text otherwise; for the Explication of PLACEUS is a terrible straining and horrid Violence offered to the Text. Notwithstanding of all this, several of

the Professor's Disciples (*Expertus loquor*) deny the guilt of Adams first Sin, and ridicule it as Non-sense, because (as I my self have heard them speak) it is impossible, that the Action of one Man can be imputed to another; and when I answered him, that this naturally destroyed the Imputation of CHRIST's Righteousness to us, He held his Peace, and said Nothing. How can the Professor think, that Orthodox Divines understand the Imputation of Sin in his Sense? For he says, we had no more Accession to Adams first Sin, than Christ had to our Commission of Sin, which certainly was none at all; for we did not represent CHRIST in sinning, as Adam represented us in his sinning. CHRIST did not sin or transgress the Law in and with us, when we transgressed; but Scripture and Catechism say, that we sinned in Adam, and with him in his first Transgression. Besides, if the Imputation of Adam's Sin to us, be nothing else, but deriving down Corruption to us, and so involving us in the Punishment threatened to him, why doth the Catechism make us to be in him, and fall with him, and that because of the Covenant made with him and us? And why the Catechism makes deriving of Corruption to be a distinct thing from our Federal Sinning in him (whereby his Sin is our Sin)? And why does the Catechism make the deriving of Corruption to us, from Adam, to be the Effect and Punishment of the Imputation, and not the Imputation it self? But further, if there be no Federal Sinning with Adam in his first Transgression, why do Scriptures and Divines speak only of our being guilty of his first Sin, and not of the rest of his after Sins? For, according to the Professors's

fessor's Notion of Imputation, the rest of Adam's
 Sins may be imputed to us as well as the first Sin,
 tho' the most pernicious Effects, flowing down to
 us, are from the first Sin, because by his first Sin
 he wholly corrupted himself, and begets corrupt
 Children like him. Yet, had he not been recovered
 by the Covenant of Grace, he that was once filthy
 would have been filthy still, i. e. Would have
 been more corrupted, even according to the Divine
 Threatning, and this additional Growing and super-
 venient Corruption would have been derived down
 to us, and so according to the Professor's Notion
 of Imputation, there would have been an Imputation
 in the same Sense of all his after Sins, as well as of
 the first Sin. What? Shall we reckon that to
 be a true Notion of Imputation, which would in-
 fer the Imputation of our Immediat Parent's Sins,
 as well as of Adam's first Sin? E. G. when a
 Parent, by a long and rooted Habit of Unclean-
 ness and Drunkness, derives to his Child (over and
 above the common Corruption, all Mankind is born
 in) a supervenient and additional Inclination to
 these two Sins; will any say, that these two Sins
 of the Parent are properly imputed to the Son,
 as Adam's Sin was imputed to us? Will any say
 that the Child, before he had a Being, whored
 and drank to Excess in and with his Father, and
 for this Guilt, in and with his Father, deserves
 Hell and Condemnation? And to compleat the
 Parallel, if the Parent by his Sin derived some
 Loathsome Disease to his Child; can it be said in
 any Sense, that the Child, before he had a Being,
 did contract these Diseases by his sinning? The
 Reason of all this is, because there is no Federal
 Relation

relation betwixt the Intermediat or Immediat
 Parents and us, as there is betwixt the first Parents
 and us. And, but for saving of Time, I could
 demonstrate, according to the Professor's Notion,
 that the Sin of a Child may be properly imputed
 to a Parent. I shall conclude this Head with two
 Quotations instead of many. The one is in RU-
 THERFORD's Book, De Providentia Cap. 18.
 211. 212. His Words are, In Adam's sinning
 we all sinned. And a little after, in Answer to an
 Objection, sayeth, ' Non ex Communionē Naturæ
 Humanæ, quæ Adamo cum Posteris suis interces-
 sit, ortus est hic Fluxus Peccati in omnes Poste-
 ros. Hoc nihil ad rem, quia Communio Natu-
 rarum non necessario facit Communionem Legis
 & Peccati, inter Patrem & Prolem. The Objection
 is just the Professor's Scheme, and 'tis this. ' Si
 quis dicat ex Communionē Naturæ Humanæ, quæ
 Adamo cum suis Posteris intercessit, ortum esse
 hunc Fluxum Peccati in omnes Posteris ipsius. An-
 swer, ' Hoc nihil ad rem, quia &c. The other
 is out of HORNBECK V. & N. Disp. De Pec-
 cato Originali. His Words are, Quum enim
 DEUS ita cum Adamo egerit, ut Personam gerit
 totius Generis Humani, sive staret sive laberetur,
 atque in eo Causa verteretur omnium, omnesque
 in eo censerentur; nec concipi nec explicari id
 potest, absque tacito et virtuali Foedere aut
 Pacto, quod DEUS consideretur fecisse cum pri-
 mo Parente, & in eo super Causa Universi Generis
 Humani eocum stante, aut labente, ut quæ is
 Nomine totius Generis & Posteritatis accepisse, re-
 putaretur & egisse, seu bene seu male, ad Lap-
 sum quo Legem & Foedus fregit sibi, Posterisque
 omnibus

' omnibus, utpote omnium & Naturæ quasi Pleni-
 ' potentiarius & κεφαλαιον; Peccati primi Impu-
 ' tatio constare & credi non potest, nisi in Adamo
 ' censitos statuamus Homines omnes, id est, nec
 ' omnino aliud quid, Confoederatos; Censiti enim
 ' sub Lege fuerunt, Adamo & toti in eo Generi
 ' posita, ut si eam observaret ipse, omnes reputa-
 ' rentur eam observasse, sin minus, reliqui peccasse
 ' Quod quid aliud est quam tale Pactum.

The Proton-pseudos of all is, the Professor's
 denying a proper Covenant with Adam, for himself
 and us. We need not, after RUTHERFORD
 and HORNBECK, quote our Great GILLESPIE
 and DICKSON, who prove, that it is a proper
 Covenant; nor TURRET: part. I. p. 633, 679.
 For the Professor will own, he Differs from them.
 In short, he should answer their Arguments, before he
 Teach his Scholars the contrary Doctrine. His great
 Argument for his singular Opinion, is, That there
 is no Stipulation, Adstipulation and Restipulation.
 But, I Beg Pardon to differ from him: For, God
 commanded Obedience, and promised Life, forbad
 Sinning, and threatned Death, and all this to Adam,
 for himself and us, and Revealed to our first Pa-
 rents all this, either by an Impression on their
 Soul, or otherwise, and that they had their
 own Stock, and the Stock of all their Posterity in
 their Hand, and that they Stood and Fell for
 their Posterity; and they being perfect, did cheer-
 fully acquiesce in that Revelation made to them.
 And upon their fulfilling a course of Obedience pre-
 scribed to them by the Lord, they might have cer-
 tainly laid claim to the Promise of Life, and Seek
 the Reward. It cannot be supposed, that the

Transf

Transaction with Adam, including his Posterity as well as himself, was unknown to him. The knowledge thereof would oblige him to the greater Care and Watchfulness, because of the vast Depositum committed to his trust. I had forgot, for a proof of a proper Covenant, that the Tree of Life was called so, because it was a Sacrament Annexed to the Covenant, and Sealing Life promised in it, to the Obedient. It likewise escaped me to mention another Argument, which is, That of all Divines I have seen, who give the Difference betwixt the two Covenants, never one of them advance this Notion of the Professor's, That the Covenant of Grace was a proper Covenant, and the Covenant of Works was not so. I have heard some say, the Covenant of Grace is Absolute, and a bundle of Promises, and not so properly a Covenant, as the Covenant of Works: But, the Professor's Notion is the Reverse almost of this: Many Protestant Divines, who assert the Absoluteness of the Covenant of Grace, Abhor Antinomianism, and do believe, and firmly maintain, That without Faith, there is no Justification, nor any Blessings consequent thereto: But, they do not make a Person's Engaging to the sincere keeping of the Law to be the Condition of the New-Covenant; This were indeed to make a Second Covenant of Works: And I have heard and seen some Ministers, who will not own a Covenant of Works made with Adam, set up for a Covenant of Works under the Gospel: This is, in my Opinion, to turn things up-side down.

E R R O R 7th.

THE Professor is not satisfied with the common Answer that Protestant Divines give to the Objections of PELAGIANS and others. 2ly, The Reason of his not being satisfied, is, the Falshood of the Answer: For, he says, we never had a Power of Obeying in ADAM, and therefore never lost it in ADAM. And 3ly, ADAM's Fault was not our Fault: This is too plain dealing, especially in one who frequently talks of ADAM as being our Representative. I ask the Reverend Professor, if we had never that Power and never lost it, whence is it we have not that Power now? And are we, according to the Professor's Scheme, obliged to have a Power, and for the want of it be condemned? A Power, I say, which in no State, and at no Time, we ever had? This dreadful Scheme is contrary to the Confess. of Faith, Cap. 9. Sect. 2 and 3. And to Catechism larger, concerning the Sinfulness and Misery of our State by the Fall. I shall not call this Error NAMES or NISMS; but its very evident, that the Imputation of ADAM's first Sin is denied by the Professor: For no Man that owns it, and says that we sinned in him, can ever speak in the Professor's Dialect. How did we sin in him, if when ADAM, by his Folly and Transgression, threw away his Power to obey, that we threw away no Power? When ADAM lost his Power to obey, we lost nothing. yea had nothing in ADAM to loss. But they who main-
tain

tain a Federal Relation between ADAM and us, and, (which is a Natural Consequence thereof) the Imputation of his first Sin, can speak in another Dialect, and say with MARCKIUS, and all Reformed Divines, That God may justly exact of us Obedience, tho' we have no Power. But the Professor thinks, God cannot do so, and therefore behoved for preserving his Justice, when he exacteth impossible Obedience, to reveal his Grace, and offer Strength to impotent Man, and if we use our Natural Powers in seeking Saving Grace and Regeneration and Power to obey, we shall obtain it. This Connexion between an unrenewed Man's Works and Saving Grace is ARMINIANISM, condemned by the Confess. Chap 10. Sect 2. and to many Scriptures quoted for the proof of the Section.

ERROR 8th.

HERE again the Professor finds Fault with Reformed Divines, for saying, The Soul coming out of the creating Hands of GOD, is deprived of Original Righteousness: And thinks, the depriving of the Soul thereof is inconsistent with GOD's Justice and Goodness: And the Reason is, because, says the Professor, our Souls never committed any thing that deserved such a Sentence, and therefore, says he, that the Soul is created as pure and holy as ever ADAM's was. These Gross Errors I am not now to confute. It is enough for me to assert, that they are contrary to ROM. 5. 12, to 20. and 1 COR. 15. 21, 22. and to the forecited places, of the

28 *Mr. Webster's Represent. Part I. Err. 9, 10*
larger and shorter Catechisms, concerning the
States of Sin and Misery the Fall brought us
into. His way of explaining the Propagation
of Corruption, without Imputation of ADAM'S
Sin, by a holy Souls being united to a corrupt
Body, I shall elsewhere confute.

ERROR 9th.

THE Professor denies, that the Necessity of
Eternal Punishment flows from Sin, as
it is an Offence committed against an
Infinite Majesty. This is contrary to the shorter
Catechism answering the Question, What
doth every Sin deserve? And to the Answer of
the Larger Catechism to the Question, What Mi-
sery did the Fall bring upon Mankind? And to
Gen. 2. 17. Rom. 6. 23. and Mat. 25. 40, 46
and Jude Ver. 7. I shall elsewhere confute this Op-
inion of the Professor. The Reason the Professor
gives for Eternal Punishments, is, the deterring
Men from sinning. But I answer, GOD would
not threaten Eternal Punishment, if Sin had not
deserved it, as being an Offence against an Infinite
GOD, unless the Professor say with Dr TILLOT-
SON, that GOD may threaten greater Punishment
than the Sin deserves, when the Reasons and Ends
of Government make it necessary.

ERROR 10th.

THAT after the Last Judgement there will
be No Sinning in HELL, and that the
Damned shall be made to Acquiesce in, and

Ac know

Acknowledge the Justice of GOD in Punishing them. This is Solidly Confuted by the Reverend Mr. JAMES HOG in a Late small Treatise Published by him. An other Reason I hear given for that Opinion, is, that the Damned are under such Extreme Torment, as Arrests and Engroffeth all their Thoughts, and Leave them only Capable of Painfull Sensation. But 1st, This Notion, That there shall be an End put to Sinning in HELL, will Appear to be False, upon the Grounds following. 1st, Spiritual Death in Sin, Corruptio Naturæ, is part thereof, which is consummated in HELL, the Second Death, is a Constant Breach of the LORD's Command, requiring Perfect Internal Holiness, and forbidding the Being of Indwelling Sin, far more the Absolute Power and Dominion thereof, under which the Damned shall Continue for Ever. 2ly. There are Sins of Omision to all Eternity in HELL: For tho' the Damned shall not be under the Law, in the Way and Manner We in a State of Probation are, for the Sanctions of the Law have a particular Respect to the Viatores, Yet there's an Eternal Immutable Law of Nature founded in the very Nature of Things, and the Obligation to Obedience flows from, and is the Result of the Rational Creatures Natural Dependance on GOD as a Creator; And the Rational Creature can, in no State whatsoever, be exempted from the Moral Government of GOD; And therefore, the Damned in HELL, not practising according to that Natural Law, E. G. not Loving GOD, not patiently acquiescing in, and submitting to His Will, not Justifying His most Severe and Just Procedure against them, are guilty

40 *Mr. Webster's Represent. Part I, Err.* 10
ty of many Sins, of Omission; And so, it is False,
to say, there's an End put to Sinning in HELL.
But further, It is Strange, to say, that they are
not Capable of any Thought or Action, but only
of Sensation of Pain; For, the Scripture Joyns
with Hells Fire, the Worm that never Dieth:
Sure, these Phrases are not fulsom and vain Me-
taphors and only Empty Sounds which signifie
nothing. All Divines are agreed, That by the
Fire, Extreme Torment is meant, and by the ne-
ver Dying Worm, a Guilty and Awakened Con-
science, reflecting on the Sins and Madnes of their
former Life. Further, The Damned cannot but
remember what a Heaven they are deprived of,
through their own Folly (this seems clear from
the Parable of DIVES), and this Remembrance
must be attended with additional Reflections on
many things; E. G. On CHRIST's Death, and
Purchased Salvation, Imbraced and Accepted by o-
thers, tho' Rejected by them, and on the Justice
and Holiness of GOD, &c. Now if the Damned,
in their most Superlative Paroxisms of Torment, are
Capable of all these Things, why is it said, they
are Capable of Nothing but Sensation of Pain?
The Glorified, when they are Dissolved in the
Highest Joyes, yet Sing their Accented Hallelujahs
to GOD and the LAMB, and are Capable of a
great Variety of other Moral Actions.

It is Strange, that a Superlative Extremity of
Pain, and the most Acute Sense thereof, when the
Greatest Deluges of Divine Vengeance are pour-
ed into the Soul, a Soul Widened and Enlarged
in all its Powers, Faculties and Capacities, to re-
ceive a Fulness of Wrath unto the Uttermost; It

Err. 10. Against Mr. Simson. 41

is strange, I say, that the Soul, in this Dismal and Horrible State, should not have the smallest Degree of Impatience or Fretfulness, tho' the Scripture tell us, there's Gnashing of Teeth for Rage. Gnashing of Teeth is taken in Scripture as the Expression of Rage Acts 7. 54. and many other Scriptures which I have no time to quote.

Whether the Professor has taken this Notion of not Sinning in HELL, from SANFORD's Latine Treatise on the CREED, or from JURIEU, de pace inter Protestantes, Contra Scultetum, I know not: But, I could have heartily wished, that Mr SIMSON had Copied after the Great Mr. George Campbel, late Professor at EDINBURGH, who in some Notes has Confuted JURIEU's Notion. I Pray, that the Reverend Professor may obtain the POET's Wish, MENS SANA IN CORPORE SANO. This ends the first Part of the first Libel, and I hope I shall have the rest finished within Ten or Twelve Days.

The Quoting at large the Words of the Libel, and the Words of Scripture and Confession, would have swelled too much this Representation, which, I fear, may be Condemned for Length, as it now is. This is subscribed 29th Octob. 1714, at EDINBURGH, Sic Subscribitur,

JAMES WEBSTER.

A *Representation of the Inconsistency of such the Errors in my first Libel that were not touched in my first Papers, (given in the Presbytery) with the Scriptures, &c.*

E R R O R First.

A *DAM* in the State of Innocency had
 “ Power of Believing in Christ.
 This is contrary to the Confess. of Faith, Cap. 4.
 2. Which asserteth our first Parents to have been
 Created with Knowledge, Righteousness and True
 Holiness, after his own Image. Now this Holiness
 and Image is the Concreated Uprightness, Eccle
 7. 29. and which includes a Power of Believing
 that was Revelatum & Revelandum to Innocent
 ADAM. Confession of Faith, Cap. 9. §. 2. saith
 ‘ Man, in his State of Innocency, had Freedom
 ‘ and Power to Will, and to Do that which was
 ‘ Good and Wellpleasing to GOD. And §. 3. of
 Cap. 9. saith, ‘ That Man, by his Fall, hath wholly
 “ ly lost all Ability of Will to any Spiritual Good.
 Whence I conclude, he hath lost a Power of Be-
 lieving in CHRIST, and therefore, had that Po-
 wer (for if he had it not, he could never have lost
 it) and if he never had that Power, nor never lost
 it; how can any Man be punished for not Belie-
 ving in CHRIST, tho’ he cannot Believe? Yea, how
 can any Man be obliged to Believe in CHRIST?
 For it is an uncontested Axiom, that we are not ob-
 bliged to what was never in our Power, in any
 State whatsoever we have been placed.

To Illustrate and Confirm this further, I find the Learned and Holy RUTHERFORD in his Exam. Armin. p. 305, 306, 307. argue this way, against this Arminian Doctrine, of ADAM's want of Power of Believing in CHRIST. Some of RUTHERFORD's Words are, "Afferimus fuisse in Adamo nondum Lapso, Potentiam proximam ad Credendum in Christum. Quia fuit in Adamo, Imago Dei perfecta, ad modum Habitus; ergo Potentia ad omnes actus, quos Creator ei imperare poterat, vel absolute, vel ex Hypothesi. Nam imago Dei includit Potentiam credendi omne id quod prima veritas revelare poterat. And Turret: pars I. Loc. 8. Q. 2. P. 629. 630. 631. confutes this Arminian Error with some of the same Arguments advanced by RUTHERFORD. I call it an ARMINIAN Error, for ARMINIUS Resp. ad Artic. p. p. 128. speaks thus, 'Dico & affirmo, assevero, profiteor & doceo ADAMUM ante lapsum non habuisse Potentiam credendi in CHRISTUM, quia Fide in CHRISTO non erat opus; ideoque DEUM non potuisse ab illo Fidem illam exigere post lapsum, hoc nimirum jure, quia ADAMUS Potentiam illam sua culpa amiserit. This Error which Mr SIMSON maintains, was advanced by ARMINIUS, to support his Doctrine of Universal Grace, and to assert, that all Mankind, even after the Fall, have a Power of Believing. See for this Error Episc. Disp. 5. Thes. 6. and CORVIN against TILLEN, and his Book likewise against ST. MOULIN; & GREVIN HOVIUS contra AMES. Fol. 183. ARNOLD contra TILLEN. Defens. Armin. says, Licet ADAMUS Dona Gratia sua ita amisit, Fidei Potentiam tamen in CHRISTO retinuit. This is a good Consequence, if ADAM in Innocence had no power

Power of believing in CHRIST, all Mankind have a power of believing in Him, because we had not lost it in ADAM. That ADAM had no Want of power of believing in CHRIST in the State of Innocence, is evident from this, That there was no Blindness or Darkness in his Understanding, nor Hardness in his Heart, nor perverseness in his Will, nor Disorder in his Affections, which are the internal Causes of Impotence to believe, but he had a compleat Rectitude of all his Faculties.

2. Neither can it be said, he had no power of believing in CHRIST in that State, because a Redeemer could not be proposed to him as the Object of his Faith: For, if this be a good Argument, to prove, he had no power to believe, then it might as well be said, he had no power to suffer patiently any Punishment inflicted by GOD on him, no power to acquiesce in GOD's Will afflicting him for Sin, no power to repent, no power to love a REDEEMER, no power to sympathize with a person in Misery, no power of mortifying indwelling Sin, because (according to the Arminians reasoning) there was no Object of that manifold power in a State of Innocence, nor was there any use for that Power, nor could the power be exercised. Now this is very absurd: For, besides that it makes ADAM in his first State a very weak impotent Man (tho' perfect in Holiness), so, it necessarily infers all his Posterity to have a power of repenting and suffering patiently under the Hand of God, &c. because we lost none of that power in ADAM.

3. The Object of ADAM's power of believing in Christ, might have been revealed to him in a

State

State
nocent
by th
involv
by his
vided

4.
have
in this
being
the br

5.
Contr
Power
to in
perfo
FOR
gainf
non
the co
by C
CHR
OW

T
T
he t
when
befor
his S
some

State of Innocence; For GOD might have told innocent ADAM that he was not to obtain Life by the Covenant of Works, but that he would involve himself and his Posterity in Condemnation by his sinning, but yet that free Grace had provided CHRIST to be a Saviour.

4. Upon this Supposition, innocent Adam would have been obliged to have cordially acquiesced in this new Way of coming at Happiness; This being so clear a Revelation of GOD's Will, for the brightest Manifestation of his Attributes.

5. If he was obliged thus to acquiesce in the Contrivance of Salvation by Christ, then he had a Power to it; For what ever ADAM was obliged to in a State of Innocence, he had a Power to perform: For it is a certain Maxim, as RUTHERFORD observes, arguing on the same Head against ARMINIUS, 'That DEUS ad impossibile non potest obligare hominem nondum lapsum. And the cordial Acquiescence in the Way of Salvation by Christ, is a most Essential Act of Faith in CHRIST, even of that Faith that justifies. So Dr. OWEN on Justification sayeth, and others.

E R R O R 2 and 3.

THERE was no Proper Covenant made with ADAM, and in him with his Posterity.

This is an old Error of the Professor's: For, he tells Mr. ROWAN, in one of his Letters, that when he Signed the CONFESSIO^N of FAITH before the Presbytery of PASLEY, he Propos'd his Scruples about the Covenant of WORKS and some other Things in the Confession, and says, he

46 *Mr. Webster's Repres. Part II. Err. 3. &*
told them freely his Opinion in these Matters, and
that he is yet in the same Opinion: And in the
same Letter, which is his 3d to Mr. ROWAN
he denies, That ADAM was a Federal Head, or
that there was any Federal Relation between him
and his Posterity, and that GOD did never Con-
stitute ADAM such a Head, whom he Certainly
foreknew would mismanage the Business. I have
spoke to this in my other Papers; yet, because
it is a Business of great Importance, I shall only
advance these two things.

1. That this Distinction of Proper and Improper
Covenant, palmed on the express Words of our
Confession, is only his Art to save himself, from an
express contradicting of the Confession. And when
He sees the Catechisms assert a Proper Covenant
He, in one of his Letters to Mr. ROWAN, boldly
libels the Westminster Divines with contra-
dicting themselves, and saith, that the Catechism's
Account, about the Covenant, differs from the Con-
fession; and that the Reason of the Catechism's dif-
fering from the Confession on that Head, was to
please two different Parties in the Assembly, and
that Things were carried in this Assembly accord-
ing as the Majority, in the different Sessions, did
favour the different Opinions concerning that Trans-
action with Adam.

2. I do not know one sound Divine, that asserts
the Transaction with Adam was a Covenant in an
improper Sense. And tho' all our Divines do not
say, it is a Covenant properly so called, yet their
Management in that Matter assert the Equivalent.
See Van. Mastr. Loc. Com. de Peccat. Origin.
who thus speaketh, ' Adamus ut commune Generis
Huma-

Humani Caput ac Fœderis Naturæ Princeps, cui Bona Malaque omnia ipsi seu publicæ Personæ, quæ sequentis Mundi Exemplar, & quasi Obses esset, tributa legimus. And by this federal Relation and Representation, He proves the Imputation of Adam's Sin to his Posterity. And a little before He hath these Words, 'Fundamentum itaque hujus Imputationis (N B) non tam est in Natura, quam a Protoplastis hauriamus, ut quam meliorem nobis dari non potuisse videantur quam habuerint, quam quidem a Fœdere quod DEO coiit, non cum Protoplastis solis, sed cum omnibus eorum Posteris, prout Lib. 3. ex professo demonstravimus. See likewise RUTHERFORD's Exam. Armin. who asserts such a Covenant, as that thereby Sin is imputed to all his Posterity, and asserts 'Hoc non factum esse Natura sed Pacto. P. 314. Quæritur, an tale Pactum probari possit, quo Adæ Peccatum omnibus Posteris imputatur? Negant Remonst. nos prob. quia Scrip. sæpe ait nos in Adamo peccasse, hoc factum est, non Natura, ergo Pacto.

E R R O R 4th.

T Here is no proper Imputation of Adam's sin. I have confuted this in my former Papers; I shall only beg, the Professor may not be offended, when I call this a Branch of SOCINIANISM: For, tho' the SOCI- NIANS deny the Conveyance of Original Corruption, which the Professor owns, yet 'the Reatus Peccati Adæ, advanced by our Divines, is denied both

46 *Mr. Webster's Repres. Part II. Err. 3. &*
told them freely his Opinion in these Matters, and
that he is yet in the same Opinion: And in the
same Letter, which is his 3d to Mr. ROWAN
he denies, That ADAM was a Federal Head, or
that there was any Federal Relation between him
and his Posterity, and that GOD did never Con-
stitute ADAM such a Head, whom he Certainly
foreknew would mismanage the Business. I have
spoke to this in my other Papers; yet, because
it is a Business of great Importance, I shall only
advance these two things.

1. That this Distinction of Proper and Improper
Covenant, palmed on the express Words of our
Confession, is only his Art to save himself, from an
express contradicting of the Confession. And when
He sees the Catechisms assert a Proper Covenant
He, in one of his Letters to Mr. ROWAN, boldly
libels the Westminster Divines with contra-
dicting themselves, and saith, that the Catechism's
Account, about the Covenant, differs from the Con-
fession; and that the Reason of the Catechism's dif-
fering from the Confession on that Head, was to
please two different Parties in the Assembly, and
that Things were carried in this Assembly accord-
ing as the Majority, in the different Sessions, did
favour the different Opinions concerning that Trans-
action with Adam.

2. I do not know one sound Divine, that asserts
the Transaction with Adam was a Covenant in an
improper Sense. And tho' all our Divines do not
say, it is a Covenant properly so called, yet their
Management in that Matter assert the Equivalence.
See Van. Mastr. Loc. Com. de Peccat. Origin.
who thus speaketh, ' Adamus ut commune Generis

Huma-

Humani Caput ac Foederis Naturæ Princeps, cui Bona Malaque omnia ipsi seu publicæ Personæ, quæ sequentis Mundi Exemplar, & quasi Obses esset, tributa legimus. And by this federal Relation and Representation, He proves the Imputation of Adam's Sin to his Posterity. And a little before He hath these Words, 'Fundamentum itaque hujus Imputationis (N B) non tam est in Natura, quam a Protoplastis hauriamus, ut quam meliorem nobis dari non potuisse videantur quam habuerint, quam quidem a Fœdere quod DEO coijt, non cum Protoplastis solis, sed cum omnibus eorum Posteris, prout Lib. 3. ex professo demonstravimus. See likewise RUTHERFORD's Exam. Armin. who asserts such a Covenant, as that thereby Sin is imputed to all his Posterity, and asserts 'Hoc non factum esse Natura sed Pacto. P. 314. Quæritur, an tale Pactum probari possit, quo Adæ Peccatum omnibus Posteris imputatur? Negant Remonst. nos prob. quia Scrip. sæpe ait nos in Adamo peccasse, hoc factum est, non Natura, ergo Pacto.

ERROR 4th.

T Here is no proper Imputation of Adam's sin. I have confuted this in my former Papers; I shall only beg, the Professor may not be offended, when I call this a Branch of SOCINIANISM: For, tho' the SOCI- NIANS deny the Conveyance of Original Corruption, which the Professor owns, yet 'the Reatus Peccati Adæ, advanced by our Divines, is denied both

48. *Mr Webster's Represent. Part II. Err. 4. 6.* both by the SOCINIANS and the Professor.

According to the Professor's Notion of Imputation of Adam's first Sin, a Father may be guilty of the Sin of his Son, in that same Sense and Way that we are guilty of Adam's Sin: Let's, for Instance, suppose, that a Parent has the whole of his Maintainance from his Son, and the Son for a Capital Crime is deprived of Life and Estate, where by the Parent is rendred utterly miserable, and is involved in Punishment (threatned by the Law) by Conjunction with his Son: In this Case, tho' the Parent be never so innocent, he is guilty of the Sin of his Son, sinn's in his Son, and with his Son. Which is grossly absurd; For its against the common Sense and Notion of Imputation amongst all that ever I read or heard of, to say, that in the foresaid Case, the Sin of the Son is imputed to the Parent.

ERROR 6th.

' **J**ustifying Faith includes in its formal Concept
' tion and Nature, Good Works and Obedience
This is, with the Professor's good Leave, SOCINIANISM, and condemned in the Scriptures which makes a continual Opposition of Faith to Works in the Business of Justification, which could not be, if Justifying Faith included Works in its very Nature. See Paul's Epistles to the Romans and Galatians, particularly, Rom. 3. 28. ' There fore we conclude, says the Apostle, that a Man is justified by Faith without the Deeds of the Law And Rom. 4. 4, 5. ' Now to him that worketh

is the Reward not reckoned of Grace but of Debt, but to him that worketh not, but believeth on him that Justifieth the Ungodly his Faith is counted for Righteousness. This Error is likewise contrary to our Larger Catechism, where in the Definition of Justification it is asserted, that Christ's perfect Obedience and full Satisfaction is received by Faith alone; And for Proof quotes Galat. 2. 16. 'Knowing that a Man is not Justified by the Works of the Law, but by the Faith of Jesus Christ. And to the Question of the Larger Catechism, 'How is Justification an Act of God's free Grace? Which is answered, Inasmuch as GOD requires Nothing of us for Justification but Faith, and quotes for Proof Rom. 3. 24. 25.

This Error, of Confounding Faith and Works *per post Liminium*, brings in again Works into the Business of Justification, which the Scriptures, with much Care, and by long and close Reasoning, had cast out. I might quote a great many Protestant Writings against the Papists and Socinians upon this Head, yet only shall direct to Dr. OWEN's Treatise on Justification P. 139. 140. 141. 142. The foresaid Error makes the Covenant of Grace to be a Covenant of Works, and our Justification before GOD to be by Works, against which the Great RUTHERFORD in his Exam. Armin. P. 500. Argues solidly, and shews it to be both Arminianism and Socinianism.

SOCINUS de Servatore Lib. 4to Cap. 11. says, 'Atque Fides & Opera, i. e. Obedientia Præceptorum Christi tanquam Forma Fidei coram DEO nos Justificat. And VORST. in his Apol. Art. 24. says, we are Justified by Works,

50 *Mr. Webster's Repres. Part II. Err. 10. 11*
as, Works are a Part of Faith. And the RE
MONSTR. ' In their Confess. Cap. 10. say
' We are Justified by Faith, as it, in its very
' Nature and Property includes the Obedience of
' Faith; to which Obedience Faith should not be
' Opposed.

ERROR 10th.

*There is a certain Necessary Connexion betwixt
our Use of the Means, or Moral Serioufness
and Regenerating Grace.*

HAVING spoke to this before, I shall only point
to RUTHERFORD's *Exam. Armin.* from P.
334. to 343. Where this Error, in all its Shapes
and Figures wherewith it can be dressed, is at
great Length, and by many solid Arguments Con-
futed.

ERROR 11th.

*There are Two Principles of Divinity, The Scrip-
tures and our Reason.*

FOR the Relevancy of this, I Refer only to the
Letters Interchanged betwixt Mr. ROWAN and
Mr. SIMSON and to LYDECKER's *Fax Veritatis* Loc. I. P. 15. *De Ratione Humana*, And it is
a Blending of SOCINIANISM and CALVINISM
together. This is Written and Subscribed at Edin-
burgh, November 13. 1714. Sic Subscribitur,

JAMES WEBSTER

Representation of the Inconsistency of the Errors of the Second Additional Libel (that were not Mentioned in the First Libel) with the Scriptures &c.

ERROR 4th.

THAT One Individual Single Soul may Inform Divers Bodies, tho' distant one from another, and in these Bodies Perform all Vital and Rational Actions, and by this Simile, The Mysterie of the Trinity is to be Explained.

I Do not say, that this Error is a Direct Contradiction to the CONFESSION of FAITH, or ATECHISMS: For 'tis such an Absurd Notion, as I presume, The Assembly of Divines knew nothing about it, and therefore could not advance any positive Doctrine against it; But it Contradicts all Sound Reason and Philosophy. For, 1st, A Souls Informing a Body, is the Old Jargon of some School-Men: For, the Organized Body Man hath its own Proper Form as all other Bodies have, and a Spirit cannot be the Form of a Body, tho' it may be said to be the Form of a Man.

2. The Souls Performing all Vital Actions is Bad Philosophy: Several of them Actions are altogether unknown to many Souls, who are altogether ignorant of the Way they are Performed, and are no ways Conscious to themselves of their Performing them: Yea they are Performed by the Body alone without the Concurrence of the Soul.

3. It is likewise Bad Philosophy to say, That

the Soul may be United to Divers Bodies at Distance one from another: I beg leave to Change the Professor's Phrase of INFORMING, into that of UNITING, which he should have used to Answer his purpose. For,

1. How can one Soul be E. G. in three Bodies whereof two are at the two Poles of the Globe and the third in some part of the Earth at the Greatest Distance from these two Poles? How can this be Conceived without a Multiplication of the Soul? If the Professor say, That the Soul Union with these 3 Bodies, does not Infer its Local Presence in them and with them, and that a Spirit is in no place: This will Contradict Scripture, which tells us, That some Spirits are in Heaven, Others in Hell; That Angels come from Heaven to Earth, to do the Will of GOD And that the Devils go to and fro upon the Earth. If a Spirit cannot be in a place, then GOD's Immenfity and Essential Presence in all Places must be denied. An Error, Contrary to many Places of Scripture and Confess. of Faith, Cap. 2. Art.

2. The Soul United to three Bodies may be at one and the same time, the Subject of many Contrary Passions in a high Degree; It may be filled with Extreme Pain and Torment, if one of its Bodies be Burning in a Fire; And at the same time Swimming in all Pleasures; if all the Senses of another of its Bodies be Gratified; And in the Third Body, it may be at the same time in a State of Indolence. The Soul may, at one and the same time, be employed in the Praising of GOD in one Body; and Blaspheming GOD in another. It may be Teaching many Gross Errors in

University, and at the same time Good Orthodox
 solid Truths in another. I beg Pardon for Insist-
 ing so long upon a Subject of this Nature: But I
 found that it was Necessary, to Expose the Grossness
 of his Simile, brought in to Illustrate and Explain
 that most August, most Glorious, and Incompre-
 hensible Myserie of the Ever Blessed Trinity.
 This Bold and Impertinent Simile serves only to
 furnish Hereticks with Matter of Scorn and Laugh-
 ter, and to Provoke them to Deny that Great
 and Fundamental Truth, with an Air of Greater
 stubbornness and Contempt.

ERROR 5th.

*There is a twofold Justification of the Elect, one
 is by Faith in Christ, the other is at the Day
 of Judgment by our Good Works.*

A Twofold Justification of our Persons (for thus
 I understand it) is not in the Scriptures, nor
 Confession, nor Catechisms: And if he mean
 any other Justification then that of Our Persons
 before God's Tribunal, he ought to have explain-
 ed it so as not to give us any Umbrage of his
 heterodoxy. Christ's most perfect Righteousness
 in all States and Conditions (we can be in at
 any time) fully sufficient for our Justification, be-
 cause it answers the most Rigorous Demands of the
 Law, and hath a Superabundant Plenitude of Me-
 rit in it.

ERROR 6th.

THE Professor never explained the Doctrine of
 CHRIST's Imputed Righteousness in the

54 *Mr. Webster's Represent. Part III. Err. 6.*
Orthodox Way and Manner, but spoke of it,
as if the Orthodox in their Explications were bor-
dering upon ANTINOMIANISM.

Besides the Gross *Innuendo* of a Heavy Charge
here, upon the Orthodox, in a matter of Great Mo-
ment; The Professor is Guilty of a very Criminal
Omission: And we cannot restrain our selves from
Well-founded Apprehensions of His Heterodoxy,
upon this Great Head, especially, if we add, his
Denial of the formal Imputation of ADAM'S first
Sin: For a proper Formal Imputation of ADAM'S
first Sin, and a Formal proper Imputation of the
second ADAM'S Righteousness Stand and Fall to-
gether. This the Apostle by a close Reasoning
and many Arguments, makes evident in his Epistle
to the *Rom. Cap. 5. 12 to v 20.* And I must De-
clare before you all, That I think this Church is
in Danger of Great Corruption in Doctrine, when
a Professor of Divinity thinks it not worth his
while to Teach his Scholars, this Great and Fun-
damental Truth, which is often called (and that ve-
ry deservedly) *Articulus Stantis Ecclesiae*; for in-
deed it's the Soul and Marrow of the Gospel, into
which the Efficacy of the Gospel is resolved by
the Apostle, *Rom. 1. 16, 17.* "The Gospel of
Christ is the Power of God unto Salvation. N. B.
" Because therein is the Righteousness of God Re-
vealed from Faith to Faith. Was not this the
Great Doctrine whereby we first Reformed from
Rome? There is no need to shew the Direct Con-
trariety of the Error of the Denial of Christ's Im-
puted Righteousness, to the Confession of Faith and
both the Catechisms; For 'tis Manifest. And
had the Professor taught what our Great Divine

both at Home and Abroad advance against Socinians, Papists, Arminians and Baxterians on this Head, when he was Holding forth to the Students, WORLDS in the MOON, and PLANETS, and Forbidding Folk to Eat certain MEATS, he had certainly Edified his Scholars more, and Prepared them better for the Holy Ministry. I speak not this from a design to Reflect, but from Zeal for Great Gospel-Truths.

ERROR 7th.

He Doubts of the Procession of the Holy-Ghost from the Son, and will not Condemn the Greek-Church for the Denial of it.

This is what I think both Bold and Dangerous; and tho' it be but a Doubt, it may be said to be contrary to the Confession of Faith Cap. 2. Art. 3. and to the larger Catechisms speaking of the Personal Properties of the three Persons. We cannot but tremble at the Consequences, this his Asserting, or Doubting may have, if his Scholars come to teach it, we know what Dreadful Divisions and Convulsions in the Latine and Greek Church this Business Occasioned.

ERROR 8th.

HE Gives 'the Magistrate a Vast Exorbitant Power in Sacris, which is Condemned by the Confess. of Faith Cap. 31. Art. 2. As it is explained by an Act of the General Assembly at London. August 27. 1647. when this National Church received the Confession as their Standard

Nor is this Power very Consistent with some Part of Art. 3. Cap. 23. Concerning the Power of the Keys of the Kingdom of Heaven, not Given to the Magistrate His Error is Gross ERASTIANISM, and would Subject the Church to a Dangerous Slavery, by Casting off Her Intrinsic Power of Indicting Her own Meetings, and Fastings and Thanksgivings, when the Magistrate is no more than an open Enemy.

E R R O R 9th.

HE 'Forbids Eating of BLOOD.

But because I have insisted so long upon other Heads, I shall pass over this with one single Observation,

That his Schollars Coming to Preach, may Create such Scruples in the Breasts of some Women of their Audience, as may be Dangerous and Fatal both to the Mother and her Child not yet Born. I presume, I'm understood.

E R R O R 10th.

HE says, 'tis probable, that the Moon and other Planets are Inhabited by Rational Creatures

This is a Speculation not very proper for the Chair of a Professor of Divinity, and hath more Danger and Contrariety to the Scriptures in it than many apprehend, as *Witsius* in *Symbolum* and *Lydeker* in *Fax Veritatis*, have at great Length made evident.

E R R O R

E R R O R 11th.

HE frequently said of MARCKIUS, *Hallucina-*
tur Author This is Pride and Insolence, and
 Heterodoxy, for either MARCKIUS or he must
 be Heterodox.

Now, Very Reverend, and my Dear Brethren, I
 have Concluded my Representation: And I per-
 swade my self, I shall have Justice done me; For,
 I know, that Zeal for Truth, with all good Men,
 will be greater than Zeal for Persons. I beg, for
 the sake of JESUS CHRIST, Your Lord and Ma-
 ster, and for the sake of Truth, and for the sake
 of Union in this Distracted and (too much al-
 ready) Divided Church, You would, with all Ex-
 pedition, bring this Business to a happy Conclu-
 sion. This is what the Professor has often cal-
 led for, and is what I humbly intreat, beg and
 expect. I cannot see what there is to hinder all
 possible Dispatch. Whatever be the Issue, I am,
 through the Grace of GOD in CHRIST, firmly
 Determined, never to give over the Prosecution of
 this weighty Affair, till it be brought to a blef-
 sed End, GOD's Glory, Your Credit, and Mr.
 SIMSON's Conviction.

This I subscribe at EDINBURGH, November
 15, 1714, Sic subscribitur

JAMES WEBSTER.

Mr.

Nor is this Power very Consistent with some Part of Art. 3. Cap. 23. Concerning the Power of the Keys of the Kingdom of Heaven, not Given to the Magistrate His Error is Gross ERASTIANISM, and would Subject the Church to a Dangerous Slavery, by Cutting off Her Intrinsic Power of Indicting Her own Meetings, and Fastings and Thanksgivings, when the Magistrate is not an open Enemy.

E R R O R 9th.

HE 'Forbids Eating of BLOOD.

But because I have insisted so long upon other Heads, I shall pass over this with one single Observation,

That his Schollars Coming to Preach, may Create such Scruples in the Breasts of some Women of their Audience, as may be Dangerous and Fatal both to the Mother and her Child not yet Born. I presume, I'm understood.

E R R O R 10th.

HE says, 'tis probable, that the Moon and other Planets are Inhabited by Rational Creatures.

This is a Speculation not very proper for the Chair of a Professor of Divinity, and hath more Danger and Contrariety to the Scriptures in it than many apprehend, as *Witsius* in *Symb.* and *Lydeker* in *Fax Veritatis*, have at great Length made evident.

E R R O R

E R R O R 11th.

HE frequently said of MARCKIUS, *Hallucina-*
tur Author This is Pride and Insolence, and
 Heterodoxy, for either MARCKIUS or he must
 be Heterodox.

Now, Very Reverend, and my Dear Brethren, I
 have Concluded my Representation: And I per-
 swade my self, I shall have Justice done me; For,
 I know, that Zeal for Truth, with all good Men,
 will be greater than Zeal for Persons. I beg, for
 the sake of JESUS CHRIST, Your Lord and Ma-
 ster, and for the sake of Truth, and for the sake
 of Union in this Distracted and (too much al-
 ready) Divided Church, You would, with all Ex-
 pedition, bring this Business to a happy Conclu-
 sion. This is what the Professor has often cal-
 led for, and is what I humbly intreat, beg and
 expect. I cannot see what there is to hinder all
 possible Dispatch. Whatever be the Issue, I am,
 through the Grace of GOD in CHRIST, firmly
 Determined, never to give over the Prosecution of
 this weighty Affair, till it be brought to a bles-
 sed End, GOD's Glory, Your Credit, and Mr.
 SIMSON's Conviction.

This I subscribe at EDINBURGH, November
 15, 1714, Sic subscribitur

JAMES WEBSTER.

Mr.

ADVERTISEMENT

THE *Extract* of Mr. Webster's *Libel*, and *Additional Libel* with the Three Parts of his *Representation* were carefully Collated with the *Signed Originals* (given in to the Reverend *Presbytery* of *Glasgow*) by the Reverend Mr. Robert Wodrow Minister of the Gospel at *Eastwood*, and the Errors of the *Extract* were Corrected by his Hand, according to the Recommendation of the Committee of *Overtures* of the last *General Assembly*: The said Mr. Wodrow did also assist in Collating this Printed Copy with the *Extract* and *Originals*: And, the Errors observed are set down in the Table hereto Subjoyn'd. So, if the Reader shall find remaining any Errors in Grammar, or Darkeness in Sense, neither the Publisher nor Printer is Liable for them.

P. 6. Line Penult. Read Power

P. 8. l. 7. r. Law

P. 9. l. 4. dele in

P. 14. l. 3. r. it self,

P. 17. l. 3. r. Consequence

P. 25. l. 2. r. Isa. 10. 6, 7, 12.

P. 29. l. 2. r. Indiscretion

P. 35. l. 13. r. Professors

P. 53. l. 8. r. His

VT
 , and
 Part
 lated
 e Re
 erend
 of pe
 strach
 g to
 Over-
 said
 this
 als
 n the
 eader
 mar,
 isher

Mr. SIMSON's
SPEECH
 TO THE
 Presbytery of *Glasgow*,
 Before Reading His ANSWERS
 TO
 Mr. WEBSTER's *Libel*,

March 29. 1715,

Moderator,

A Process against a Professor of Divinity,
 for Errors, said to be Taught by Him
 in the Divinity School, being an Event,
 that has Rarely happened in this Church;
 It may be thought Reasonable and Necessary,
 that I should take some Notice of this Extra-
 ordinary Passage of Divine Providence, that touches
 me so Nearly; and give some Account how it hath
 come to pass, before I Answer the Libel, My
Accuser hath brought against me: Which I shall
 Endeavour

ADVERTISEMENT

THE *Extract* of Mr. Webster's *Libel*, and *Additional Libel* with the Three Parts of his *Representation* were carefully Collated with the *Signed Originals* (given in to the Reverend *Presbytery* of *Glasgow*) by the Reverend Mr. Robert Wodrow Minister of the Gospel at *Eastwood*, and the Errors of the *Extract* were Corrected by his Hand, according to the *Recommendation* of the *Committee of Ordinatures* of the last *General Assembly*: The said Mr. Wodrow did also assist in Collating this Printed Copy with the *Extract* and *Originals*: And, the Errors observed are set down in the Table hereto Subjoyn'd. So, if the Reader shall find remaining any Errors in Grammar, or Darkeness in Sense, neither the Publisher nor Printer is Liable for them.

P. 6. Line Penult. Read Power

P. 8. l. 7. r. Law

P. 9. l. 4. dele in

P. 14. l. 3 r. it self,

P. 17. l. 3. r. Consequence

P. 25. l. 2. r. Isa. 10. 6, 7, 12.

P. 29. l. 2. r. Indiscretion

P. 35. l. 13. r. Professor

P. 53. l. 8. r. His

Mr. SIMSON's
SPEECH
 TO THE

Presbytery of *Glasgow*,

Before Reading His ANSWERS

TO

Mr. WEBSTER's *Libel*,

March 29. 1715.

Moderator,

A Process against a Professor of Divinity,
 for Errors, said to be Taught by Him
 in the Divinity School, being an Event,
 that has Rarely happened in this Church;
 It may be thought Reasonable and Necessary,
 that I should take some Notice of this Extra-
 ordinary Passage of Divine Providence, that touches
 me so Nearly; and give some Account how it hath
 come to pass, before I Answer the Libel, My
Accuser hath brought against me: Which I shall
 Endeavour

Endeavour to do, by Relating briefly, My Own and Mr. Webster's Conduct, with Respect to this Affair

As to My Self, I have been, and still am sensible, of my being very Unequal, for Discharging Suitably this Great and Important Trust Committed to me by the Authority of this Church. Yet, I have Endeavoured to go about the Duties of my Office Faithfully, according to my Capacity in a Humble Dependance on GOD our Saviour, for the Promised Assistance of his Unerring Spirit. And have, in the first Place, taken for my Rule the Holy Scriptures, which are the Perfect Rule of Faith and Manners. I do, in the Second place for a help to follow this Rule aright, set before me that Excellent Sum of the Doctrine of the Gospel, which is Contained in Our *Confession of Faith* and *Catechisms*; Having, after frequent Examination, and Mature Deliberation been Convinced that it was agreeable to the Word of GOD, the Supreme Rule; From which Persuasion, I have been Moved, Cheerfully to Sign our *Confession of Faith* twice, and still to Adhere to it, as the *Confession* of My Faith. And being Convinced, from Experience, of the Necessity and Usefulness of this Excellent Compend of Christian Doctrine to Students of Divinity, I do carefully Explain it to these under my Care, once a Year, together with Professor Marck's little Compend; and to the best of my Skill, endeavour to Prove and Defend the Doctrine of the Gospel, therein delivered, against these who Deny or Oppose it.

In Performing this Hardest part of my Work wherein I am Obligated to do my best, to Convince

nce Gainfayers, and Stop the Mouths of Un-
 ly and Vain Talkers, and Deceivers; I find
 self sometimes obliged, to use some other Ar-
 guments for the Truth, and other Answers to
 objections, than are Used by Professor *Marckius*,
 and some other Divines, justly esteemed among us:
 that, in handling Controversie, I lay but little
 weight on some *Hypotheses* that severals make use
 of, either for the Proof, or Defence of the Truth,
 and for the Answering of Objections, and Cavills
 of Adversaries, I make use of some Propositions,
 that are purely Speculative, or only Probable, and
 have no necessary Connexion with our Faith or
 practice, and are of no other Use in Divinity, that
 to know, much less in the Pulpit, but to answer
 the Cavills of Adversaries; for which they are
 sometimes very necessary: Of which sort are these,
 That there will be no sinning in Hell after the last
 judgement. And probably all Infants dying in In-
 fancy shall be Saved. And that probably the Num-
 ber of the Elect is greater than that of the Dam-
 ned, &c.

This I thought it my Duty to do, on these two
 accounts: First, Because, I found that some of
 the common *Hypotheses*, instead of Removing Dif-
 ficulties, and Convincing Adversaries, did rather
 increase them, and lay our Doctrine more open
 to Objections. E. G. The *Hypotheses* of Physical
 predetermination in sinful Actions; And that of
 the Covenant of Works being a Proper Covenant
 in the Sense of Lawyers; Which any Person that
 considers the ARMINIAN Controversy, as now
 stated, will easily perceive. I therefore, without
 refuting these *Hypotheses*, but only noticing their
 Insufficiency,

Insufficiency, do endeavour to shew, that the Truths, for the Defence of which, they are advanced, do not necessarily depend upon them, but may be proved and defended another way; And leave the Students to choose the one or the other, as they find most convincing.

2ly, I propose some other Arguments and Answers than are found in later Systems; because, some may perceive more Evidence and Force in one, and others in another. In following which Method, I have only used that Liberty which the best Divines of Esteem among us have used, and that with good Reason. And as they were not Quarrelled for this Practice by the Churches to which they belonged, so I thought my self in no danger of being Challenged by the Church of *Scotland*, being Conscious to my self, that I had advanced nothing, but what, to the best of my Skill, tended to the Proving or Defending the Doctrine of the Gospel, summ'd up in our *Confession of Faith* and *Catechisms*.

Now, this is all the Real Ground that I know for this Process, and the Clamour and Noise that has been raised and so industriously spread over, and even beyond this *Church* and *Kingdom*, about my Teaching *Error*. Notwithstanding whereof, after the most Serious Reflection and Careful Examination, I cannot find, that I have advanced any thing, which has not been formerly taught by some or other of these Divines, who have by the Members of this Church, been esteemed most Famous, for their Eminent Piety and Learning, and Soundness in the Faith, as will appear by my Answers. But altho' I had advanced some things wholly New, I could

ould not be Justly Blamed, unless such Propositions were first fairly Examined by Scripture and Reason, and found to be False and Prejudicial to the Truth: In which Case I should reject them with the first.

That some things New and Useful may be found out, and Lawfully propos'd by Me, or any other Professor, Minister, or Christian, I hope, will be thought Reasonable by all, who consider that several things New, whereby the knowledge of the Truth was Promoted, have been advanc'd since our first Reformation from Popery, and the framing of the Reformed *Confessions*; which their Compilers designed as a mean to Encrease, but not to Restrain Peoples Growth in Grace and in the Knowledge of God, and of the Truths of the *Gospel*: And this will still be allowed by these, who are perswaded, that our Knowledge in *Divinity* is not yet arriv'd at Perfection, and that the Spirit is not Restrained now more than formerly; Which if it be not, then, Endeavours to find out what may yet ly hid in the Word of God, and to set *Gospel Truths* in Clearer Light, and to Refute more Convincingly the Objections and Cavils of it's Adversaries, ought to be Encouraged, and even any thing New ought to be Calmly and Impartially Weighed. If we follow not this way, we Recede from our Protestant Principles.

Upon the whole of this Part of my Conduct, tho' I be sensible of many Failings, for which I desire to be Humbled in the Dust before GOD, yet my Conscience does not smite me, for having designed to advance any Thing that to me seemed contrary to our *Confession* and *Catechisms*, or to render

render the Truth of them suspected. But, on the contrary, the oftner I have read and taught them I have been the more convinced of their Truth and have used my best Endeavours, to prove the Truths summed up in them, by the best Arguments I could find, and to defend them by such Methods, as I found in Experience and Observation had been most effectual, either to Convince, or Stop the Mouths of Adversaries.

This begets me Peace of Conscience, in midst of all the Calumnies and Reproaches, wherewith I have been unjustly Loaded; As it also does in this Extraordinary Event, of my being under Processes for Teaching Error.

It is also an Allay to my present Trouble, that I find great Numbers of Christians, of no small Consideration, did, through mistaken Zeal for Received Opinions, or wrong Information, take Offence at, Blame and Contend with the Apostles Peter and Paul, for discharging faithfully the Duties of their Office, according to the express Command of GOD; On which Account, they found it their Duty, to Vindicate their Doctrine and Practice before the Church. When such Things befell the Eminent Apostles of Christ, sure, so Mean and Unworthy a Servant of Christ as I am, cannot think it strange, that I should be called in Question, even by sincere Christians of no small Account, promoted thereunto by the like wrong Information, mistaken Zeal. *If such Things were done in the Green tree, how much more may they in the Dry*

Now, that this is much my Case, with respect to my Accuser, and others, who have believed the Stories chiefly spread by him, I hope will

Evident by my Answers.

He has made many Protestations of His being
 by Zeal for Truth, in this Affair, which is
 plausible Pretence that every one is ready to
 assent at; Yet it had need to be well Examined;
 for there are so many Counterfeits of it, that
 they Deceive even Good Men, as in the Instance
 now mentioned above; And the worst Things
 have been, and still are done under this Vail.
 Our LORD tells his Disciples *Joh. 16. 2. Yea*
Time cometh, that whosoever killeth you, will
think that he doth GOD Service; which the Event
 will be good: And a notable Instance of this was
 before his Conversion, who tells us, that
concerning his Zeal he persecuted the Church, Phi-
3. 6. And he says before Festus, Acts 26. 9
privily thought with my self, that I ought to do
many Things contrary to the Name of Jesus of
Nazareth, which Things I also did. &c.
 I do not design to advance any Libel here against
 Mr. *Weston*, nor to detract from his Good Qua-
 lities, for which I Love and Esteem him; But,
 there are some Pieces of his Conduct, that have
 a near Relation to the Present Affair, which on this
 occasion I am obliged to take Notice of, and He
 ought seriously to Reflect on: Such as, 1st, His
 easily Receiving, Believing, and Spreading
 Reports of Me, which, I Guess, He would
 be ill, if done to Himself, whereof there want
 Occasions: For, if Reports be True, He has,
 many Years, had a Quarrel with Professors of
 Unity: And, it is well known to his own Pres-
 bytery, and the City of Edinburgh, with how many
 injuries and Reproaches, He Loaded a late e-

minent Professor there, as if he had taught Error. And, 'tis also well known, what Mean Arts he used to Defame the Present Worthy Professor there: And the Reason of His so doing is no less Notour; a few are so Credulous, as to Believe it was pure Zeal for Truth, made him Treat these Reverend and Worthy Professors so Unchristianly: It is also well known, that, too often, in the Pulpit, He uttered Accusations of Error, or Unfaithfulness, more generally against many Ministers, or more particularly against certain Persons, whom he Describes; Wherefore, if such Stories might be depended on, every Impartial Person, as well as I, must think it an Allay in My Case, that I am Prosecuted by One, who is An Ordinary Accuser of the Brethren. And My Judges would be obliged to take Notice of it, According to Form of Process, Chap. 7.

2ly, HIS Conduct in this Affair of Mine, gives Me just Ground of Suspicion, that something more than Zeal for Truth and GOD's Glory does move Him in this Pursuit.

For 1st, When I Converſed with Him, September 1710, at Moffat, on several of the Points now Libelled, such as, *The probable Salvation of Infants dying in Infancy; No Sinning in Hell before the Last Judgement; The Dark Hint of Grace discovered to the Heathen; And the accounting the Imputation of Adam's first Sin to his Posterity by Considering the Covenant of Works under the Notion of a Law:* He was so far from calling them Errors, that, he said, 'He thought they could do no Harm, but might contribute to the ease of the Refutation of the Pelagian and Arminian Errors; And, with Respect to the Last, He said, that

saw, that the Imputation of *Adam's* first Sin, could be as well accounted for, My Way, as by taking the Covenant of Works, to be a strict and Proper Covenant; And said, He would Defend Me against all that He should find Blaming Me on that Account: And when I met with Him again at *Moffat* the Year following, He said, He had done so.

Now, if He had changed his Mind, He should have let me know it, and his Reasons for it, had he acted Brotherly, which, He must owne, He never did. Nor did I ever observe, that He Disliked any Thing I had told Him, until I Displeased Him in some other Things. The first of which was, that I thought Mr. *Mair's* going to *Closeburn*, was Inexpedient, as then Circumstanced.

But 2ly, In stead of telling me, what, upon second Thoughts, he judged wrong in any Thing that I had told him, I heard, that about, and after *August 1712*, He took the Liberty to Slander me in very publick Companies, for *Teaching Gross Errors*; And, at length, He thus Defamed me before many of his own *Presbytery*; In which He acted directly contrary to the *Form of Process*, Chap. 7. §. 4.

The many Accounts I got of his Course of Slandering me, moved me to write a Letter to him the 23. of *Febr. 1713*. wherein I freely told Him my Opinion of Four Points of *Divinity*, which I heard were the Subject of his Declamations against me; and desired him to write to me freely, His thoughts of what he should find Wrong in My Opinion, or to Print a Book against me, as he had been talking, or to Prosecute me before my Law-

full Superiors; And I did freely Expostulate with Him for his Slandering Me, and told Him that I could not suffer him to Persist in it. But instead of following any of these three fair Methods He sent Me a Return that favoured more of a Reply, than of a Minister or Brother *, and went on in his Course of Slandering; for which I delayed Prosecuting him (as I justly might) from the Regard I had to the Dangerous Circumstances in which this Church, and the whole Protestant Interest, were then lying.

3ly, When I went, the August following, Edinburgh, to the Commission of the General Assembly, I was very Desirous to have an Interview with Him, before as many of the Brethren of the Presbytery, before whom he had Slandered me, could be got together, (and it seems he was also Desirous to meet with me) so, I spake to Several Brethren

* An exact Double of the said Return, in which he subscribed for Febr. as was evident to the Ministers at Edinburgh.

Edr 13 March 17

R. S. In Answer to your Letter of the 23d of Decr I know no Injury done to you by, R S your humble S

JA. WEBSTER

P. S I'm resolv'd by Grace to stand for the Defence of Christs Truth and the Purity of the Doctrine profess'd in this Church agst any Man who vents Arguments destructive of the same; against Errors that touch near the Foundation: and no threats, no insolence, and no rude treatment shall I hope ever move me to change my firm and fix'd resolution. Therefore there is no Man that can make me singe a Palinodium, and eat in what I have said. You may for me take what Methods you thinke fitt for your own Vindication, if you thinke your Reputation hurt. Our Good Lord keepe this Church from Baxterian, Arminian and Pelagian Errors.

brethren of that Presbytery, and got a Time and
 place fixed, and some sent to Desire Mr. Webster
 to Meet there with us, and to bring with Him any
 brethren he pleased, which he did. So, We Met,
 the 13 of August 1713 at Mr. Kello's House in
 Edinburgh; and Mr. Webster, before he would Con-
 fer with me, demanded, that it should first be Agre-
 ed, that what ever might pass between us, should
 not be made Use of in any Process, that might fall
 out afterwards: Which both the Brethren present,
 and I thought very Reasonable, seeing we were
 met for a Friendly Conference, to Remove Mistakes,
 and Prevent any Process; wherefore, I heartily A-
 greed to it. Then Mr. Webster Accused me of Dis-
 ingenuity, for keeping up My Letter of Febr. 23.
 for 6 or 7 Weeks, before I sent it to him; The
 falsehood of which I presently Convicted him of,
 by Comparing the Date of my Letter to Him, with
 the Date of His Return to me.

Then He Produced and Read a Libel of 12 Ar-
 ticles, of which the Four Points that I had wrote
 to him, were a Part. I told him, that Se-
 veral of them were utterly False, and that Some
 of them were truly my Opinion, but not Errors;
 and was willing to Confer with him about these,
 if it could be managed in a Brotherly Way; And
 proposed That of No Sinning in Hell after the
 last Judgement, for a Tryal: But, after an Es-
 say made, finding, there could be nothing but
 Wrangling, I told him, it was Needless to Essay
 Conferring with him, while he was in that
 Temper.

And he having said, That he designed to Pro-
 secute me, for these Errors, Contained in his Paper,

I Challenged him to do it, and told him, I should be Glad how soon he Intended his Proceſs; and was going to leave him ſo, but that ſome Brethren Urged, that ſeeing We had Met to Remove ſuch Miſtakes, and prevent further Noiſe, we ſhould endeavour to talk of ſuch things in a Friendly manner. To which I replied, That it was Maniſeſt, from the Eſſay had been made, that this could not be done; Wherefore, I would Confer no more with Him, by Word of Mouth, but, if he pleaſed to give me his Paper, or a Double of it, I ſhould Write My Thoughts on all theſe Heads, and Read them to him at another Meeting of the Brethren the week following; Which at firſt He Refuſed, but afterwards Complied with, and only Objected, that I would go away, and not give in my Answers; On which I promiſed, to Leave them with One of the Brethren, to be Read to him in a Meeting, in Caſe I ſhould be obliged to go off the Town: And this I agreed to, on theſe Expreſs Terms, that He ſhould Answer any Queſtions in Divinity, that I might propoſe to him, to which he Agreed, and ſtruck Hands with me upon it. And accordingly, the next Day, he ſent me a Line with Thirteen *Queries*, which I drew Answers unto, and Read to him at a Meeting in the ſame Houſe, the 20th of *Auguſt*; and that ſame day, before we met, I ſent him a Line, with my *Queries* to him, which he never as yet Answered, and, I ſuppoſe, will not readily Adventure to Answer.

Now, the Second Claſs of *Errors*, Inſerted in His *Libel*, are the Pretended Answers, which at that Conference I gave to his *Queries*; By which he has directly Violated the *Faith* of the Agreement be-

tween Him and Me, entred into at his own Desire. Had he only Inserted in his Libel, the 12 Articles that he Read to me before the *Brethren*, I should not have Blamed him; but, his making my Answers, whether Real or Pretended, a part of his *Libel*, is a manifest Violation of our Agreement. For, at the Second Meeting, on the *Faith* of this Agreement, I gave him freely My Thoughts on His Articles, in a Friendly manner, in *Writing*; which, I found, could not be Conveniently done at the first meeting, by *Word of Mouth*.

After this, the 17th, of *March* following, he Accused Me of *Error*, before the *Presbytery* of *Edinburgh*, to which I was not Subject, and afterwards He did the same before the *Synod* of *Lothian* and *Tweeddale*, and at length before the last *General-Assembly*; by both which Courts He was Commanded to make Good this Charge against Me, before my Immediate Superiors at *Glasgow*. Yet he not only Delay'd, but when Required, did Refuse to come hither, and prove me Guilty of *Socinian* and *Arminian* Errors, which he had so Publickly Undertaken to do; as may be seen by his Letter He wrote to the Reverend *Presbytry* of *Edinburgh*, from *Kinnoul*, *July* 13th 1714. In which He says, He had no Call from God, to come to *Glasgow*, and Prosecute me, and that it was his Fixed Purpose that he would not come; or to this purpose: Which is very strange, in a Person, that Pretends so much Zeal for Truth, when *Scripture*, *Law* and *Equity*, and the *Authority* of this Church, Obligated him to come and Prove his Charge. But, when he understood, that I was Resolved to Pursue Him for *Slander*, this cleared his Call, and made him think

fit to Insist: And I suppose, He will not Deny, that He said to some of My Friends, that He would not have Prosecuted Me, unless I had Forced him to it. So that, by His Conduct, it appears, all his Zeal amounts only to a *Loud Publisbing, and Bold Spreading of Calumny and Slander*, with a design to leave it there. This Requires no great Measure of Love to God, or his Neighbour, or Concern for the Truths of the Gospel.

I humbly conceive, tho' a Person should appear very Warm, and Profess great Zeal, in Contending with, and Beating his Fellow Servants, but yet is called to set his Face against the Common Enemy, in Defence of the Truth, should, in Prospect of Danger, turn his Back and flee away, he has no great Reason to Boast much of his Zeal for GOD or his Interest, or at least, that he Loves Christ More than his Brethren.

I pray, the Lord may not suffer this Church to degenerate so far, even under outward Peace, as that it may be truly said of it, what a famous Divine (a good while since at his Rest) did with too much Truth say of the Church in his Time, viz. *Ac nos omnibus, non Justitiæ Portas, sed Maledictionis, mutuæque in nos ipsos Audaciæ Fanuas aperimus. Atque hic apud nos optimus habetur, non quod Dei metu præditus, ne Verbum quidem otiosum emiserit, sed qui Proximum suum plurimis Maledictionibus vel aperte, vel in ænigmatis fixerit.----- Huc accedat quod alii aliorum peccata observamus, non ut lugeamus, sed ut exprobremus; neque ut medicinam affertamus, sed ut novum Vulnus infligamus, atque Proximorum Vulneribus Excusationem vitii nostri petamus. Jam vero malos & bonos, non vita, sed*

dissent

dissentio, vel amicitia, tanquam notis quibusdam ingnunt: Et quæ hodie laudamus, eadem crasino die vituperamus: Et quæ apud alios infamia notantur, Eadem apud nos Admirationis sunt.----- Quanquam ii quidem, qui de Fide ac Supremis & Primariis quæstionibus pugnant, ita sane afficiantur: Nec ego reprehendo, immo, si vere loquendum est, insuper etiam laudo, iisque gratulor. Atque utinam ex eorum numero sim qui pro veritate decertant, atque in offensionem & odium incurrunt.----- Nunc autem nonnulli sunt, qui de parvis etiam rebus, nec quicquam utilitatis afferentibus, digladiantur, sociosque mali, quoscunque possint, admodum imperite ac temere asciscant. Posteaque his omnibus fides prætexitur, atque sanctum & venerandum hoc Nomen privatis eorum Contentionibus distrabitur.

I shall only add, that the Respect I had to the Preserving the Purity of Doctrine in this Church, especially in the Dangerous Circumstances, wherein it was in the Moneth of June last, and the Consciousness of my own Innocency, with an ardent Desire of getting this Affair brought speedily to an Impartial Tryal, moved me then to Apply to this Reverend Presbytery, whereof I am a Member, to use fit Means to Oblige Mr Webster to Insist, which if he had then done in due Form, it might have been near an End, if not quite finished before now. And having received Mr Websters Libel to See and Answer, under the Protestation taken by the Reverend Principal of the College, the 29 of September last, conform to the 14 Act of the General Assembly 1711, to which I then adhered; I do now (adhering still to the said Protestation

fit to Insist: And I suppose, He will not Deny, that He said to some of My Friends, that He would not have Prosecuted Me, unless I had Forced him to it. So that, by His Conduct, it appears, all his Zeal amounts only to a Loud Publisbing, and Bold Spreading of Calumny and Slander, with a design to leave it there. This Requires no great Measure of Love to God, or his Neighbour, or Concern for the Truths of the Gospel.

I humbly conceive, tho' a Person should appear very Warm, and Profess great Zeal, in Contending with, and Beating his Fellow Servants, but yet is called to set his Face against the Common Enemy in Defence of the Truth, should, in Prospect of Danger, turn his Back and flee away, he has no great Reason to Boast much of his Zeal for GOD or his Interest, or at least, that he Loves Christ More than his Brethren.

I pray, the Lord may not suffer this Church to degenerate so far, even under outward Peace, as that it may be truly said of it, what a famous Divine (a good while since at his Rest) did with too much Truth say of the Church in his Time, viz. *Ac nos omnibus, non Iustitiæ Portas, sed Maledictionis, mutuaque in nos ipsos Audaciæ Januas aperimus. Atque hic apud nos optimus habetur, non qui Dei metu præditus, ne Verbum quidem otiosum emiserit, sed qui Proximum suum plurimis Maledictionibus vel aperte, vel in ænigmatis fixerit.----- Huc accedat quod alii aliorum peccata observamus, non ut lugeamus, sed ut exprobremus; neque ut medicinam afferamus, sed ut novum Vulnus infligamus, atque Proximorum Vulneribus Excusationem vitæ nostræ petamus. Jam vero malos & bonos, non vita, sed*

dissent

*dissentio, vel amicitia, tanquam notis quibusdam
 ingnunt: Et quæ hodie laudamus, eadem crasino
 die vituperamus: Et quæ apud alios infamia no-
 tantur, Eadem apud nos Admirationis sunt.-----
 Quanquam ii quidem, qui de Fide ac Supremis
 & Primariis quæstionibus pugnant, ita sane affici-
 antur: Nec ego reprehendo, immo, si vere loquen-
 dum est, insuper etiam laudo,isque gratulor.
 Atque utinam ex eorum numero sim qui pro veri-
 tate decertant, atque in offensionem & odium in-
 currunt.----- Nunc autem nonnulli sunt, qui de
 parvis etiam rebus, nec quicquam utilitatis afferen-
 tibus, digladiantur, sociosque mali, quoscunque pos-
 sint, admodum imperite ac temere asciscant. Post-
 eaque his omnibus fides prætexitur, atque sanctum
 & venerandum hoc Nomen privatis eorum Conten-
 tionibus distrabitur.*

I shall only add, that the Respect I had to the
 Preserving the Purity of Doctrine in this Church,
 especially in the Dangerous Circumstances, wherein
 it was in the Month of June last, and the Con-
 sciousness of my own Innocency, with an ardent
 Desire of getting this Affair brought speedily to an
 Impartial Tryal, moved me then to Apply to this
 Reverend Presbytery, whereof I am a Member, to
 use fit Means to Oblige Mr Webster to Insist,
 which if he had then done in due Form, it might
 have been near an End, if not quite finished be-
 fore now. And having received Mr Websters Libel
 to See and Answer, under the Protestation taken
 by the Reverend Principal of the College, the
 29 of September last, conform to the 14 Act of
 the General Assembly 1711, to which I then adhe-
 red; I do now (adhering still to the said Pro-
 testation

testation) give in the following Answers to the said *Libel*, wherein I have not confined my self, to say only what I was in Law strickly obliged unto, but have freely told my Thoughts on the several Heads of his *Libel*, to Convince Him and others, that I Design nothing but Open and Fair Dealing. And, if any thing advanced by Me now, or formerly Taught, shall be thought wrong, I am very ready, on better Information, and hearing Convincing Arguments, to Change My Opinion for a Better; Knowing that I am as liable to Mistakes, as any body else, even in several things wherein I think my self in the Right: For I do Profess my self *Only a Learner*, while I Sojourn here on Earth.

Mr.

beresf
arg.
I.
an b
2ly.
Contr
y hin
f Fa
6.
or G
which
ure,
Teach
part

Mr. Simsons Answers

TO

Mr. Websters Libel,

Given in to the Reverend Presbytery of Glasgow.

Answer to *ARTICLE 1st of Libel*
and *Additional Libel.*

MR. Webster says, *The first Error containeth several Propositions, which cannot be proven by Scripture, or by Necessary Consequence from them; and are therefore Contrary to Confess. Chap. I. §. 2. and larg. Catech. Q. 2d. To which I Answer,*

1. That these Propositions, as Taught by Me, can be Proved by Scripture.

2ly. Altho' they could not, they would not be Contrary to the Passages of the Conf. and Cat. Cited by him, which say, *that the Scriptures are the Rule of Faith and Life*: Which Words, as Explained §. 6. are to be understood of *all things necessary for GOD's Glory, Mans Salvation, Faith and Life*; which are to be Proved either by Express Scripture, or by Consequence. Now, seeing I do not Teach, that these Propositions are a Necessary part of the Rule of our Faith and Life, altho' they

they could not be Proved by Scripture, I do not Contradict what is there said in the *Confession* or *Catechism*.

PROPOSITION I. *The End of GODs Revelation towards the Heathen, is not only their Conviction and Greater Restraint, but also that they may seek after further Discoveries of the LORD to themselves, viz. of his being Reconcilable, and of the Way How. This, Mr. Webster says, is Contrary to Confess. Chap. I. §. I. that Mentions GODs Ends of Natural Revelation to the Heathens, without the least Innuendo of these given by me; and on the Contrary asserts, that GOD Revealed His Will to His Church, because the Heathens have not a sufficient Knowledge of GOD. To which I*

Answer 1st, Altho' these Ends Assigned by me were not Comprehended in what the *Confession* says, They would not, on that Account, be Contrary to it. There are Hundreds of Mathematical Propositions, which are not Comprehended in what is said in Scripture or our *Confession*, Yet are Contrary to Neither of them. The two Ends Mentioned by *Marckius*, and Named in the *Libel*, are as little insinuated in these Words of our *Confession* as Mine are.

2^{dly}, Supposing there be any dark Hint given by the Light of Nature, and Works of Creation and Providence, Comprehending Tradition, that GOD is Reconcilable to Sinners; this will further manifest the Goodness, Wisdom and Power of GOD, and leave Men more Inexcusable, than if no such Hint were given; and would also oblige Men to seek after a fuller Discovery of it: Whence 'tis evident, that it would be comprehended under the

End

End Mentioned in the *Confession*. And that it may appear, I am not Singular, in Assigning this End, I shall Name on or two Divines (whom I hope Mr. Webster will allow to be Orthodox) who Mention the same End; As Turretin, Part. Ima, Loc. I. Quæst. 4ta §. 4. who to other Ends of Natural Theology adds, *Ut Incitamentum sit ad Quærendam Illustriorem Dei Revelationem*. Pictet. Lib. I. Cap. 2. §. 4. *Rursus Incitamentum est, ad Quærendam Illustriorem Revelationem &c.*

3dly, Seeing the Lybel Owns, that I Teach, that the Heathen cannot know the Particular Way of Salvation; and should have said further, (had it fully and fairly told the Truth) that I also Teach, that the Knowledge of the Particular Way of Salvation, in such Measure as GOD thinks fit, must Necessarily be Known, Believed, and Complied with, by all Adult Persons, that are Mentis Compotes, else they cannot be Saved: It follows plainly from this Doctrine of Mine, that the Heathens have not a Sufficient Knowledge of GOD, and of His Will, which is Necessary to Salvation; And therefore, it is a great Mercy, that the LORD was pleased to Reveal Himself to his Church; Yea Absolutely Necessary, to the Salvation of its Members.

This Proposition therefore, Agrees very well with our *Confess.* and so I Plead, that it is not Relevant.

PROPOS. II. *The Heathens may Know by the Light of Nature, that GOD is Reconcilable.* What I say is, *By the Light of Nature, and the Works of Creation, and Providence, Including Tradition, GOD has given an Obscure Objective Revelation*

lation unto all Men, of his being Reconcilable to Sinners; which the Heathen may come to the Knowledge of, if they observe and consider it.

This, Mr. Webster does not alledge to be Contrary to any Part of our Confession; Therefore I should pass it, did he not insinuate (against sufficient Reason given him by me to the contrary) that I Held *Universal Redemption*, by proposing this Question; *How is GOD Reconcilable to all the Heathen Nations, without Christ had satisfied Justice for them? Is not this Universal Redemption?* To which I answer,

First, That his Question perverts the Words of the Libel, which are, *That all the Heathen may know, that GOD is Reconcilable to Sinners Indefinitely*; Whereas his Question imports that GOD is Reconcilable to all the Heathen Nations *Collectively*.

2dly, I Ask him, How is GOD Reconcilable to all the Christian Nations, unless Christ had Satisfied Justice for them? Is not this near a Kind to Universal Redemption? I Ask him again, How could our Lord command his Disciples to go and Preach the Gospel to all Nations, unless he had satisfied Justice for them? When Mr. Webster gives a sound Answer to these, the Question he asks me will be answered also: And he is Equally obliged to answer me, as I am to answer him. So, I Conclude, This Proposition is not Relevant.

PROP. III. *That the Heathen may know, there is a Remedy for Sin provided.* But I say not, that they do know it is so, as Mr. Webster alledges: To which he adds, out of the Second Libel, that the Heathen have the Gospel some Way promul-

gate to them; And alledges, *this is contrary to our Confession* Chap. 7. §. 5, 6.

ANSW. 1st, This Proposition is discovered to the Heathen the same Way with the former, being presupposed to it; For, if GOD be Reconcilable to Sinners, he has from Eternity provided a Remedy for Sin; Unless we would Absurdly Ascribe to GOD Temporary Decrees and Resolutions. This Proposition with the former is manifestly a Part of the Gospel; but so small, as is no Way sufficient to Salvation: Yet It is a great Encouragement to Engage all Men, to seek after a Clearer and Fuller Revelation, and therefore renders utterly Inexcusable all that slight it: And so may, on that Account, be called *An Implicite Revelation of the Gospel*.

ANSW. 2^d, It is not Contrary to our Confess. Chap. 7. §. 5, 6. Which Teach, *That the Covenant of Grace, was differently administred under the Law, and under the Gospel*: For this Objective Revelation of GOD's being Reconciled, and having provided some Remedy for Sin, which, I say, is given to the Heathen, doth neither teach them *Christ*, the only Remedy, nor the Covenant of Grace, which is the Method of applying that Remedy; and therefore cannot teach them the One or Other of the Dispensations of the Covenant of Grace, mentioned in these Paragraphs of the *Confession*.

ANSW. 3^d, It is not Contrary to *Eph. 2. 12.* or the like, that shew the State wherein the Heathen lye; Because, according to my Opinion, notwithstanding this Objective Revelation of GOD's being Reconcilable, they may Slight it, and live in

in Gross Idolatry and Wickedness, and never attain to the necessary Knowledge of the Way of Salvation, contained in the Covenants of Promise: As they also may and do live without the Knowledge of the true GOD, and his Worship and Service, and so be *Atheoi*: Altho' GOD's Eternal Power and God-Head be clearly revealed to them by the Works of Creation and Providence. Now while they live in this State of Ignorance and Wickedness, they can have no solid Hope of Salvation; yet they are not wholly Excluded from the Covenant of Grace, or put in the same State with fallen Angels, seeing GOD can send them the Gospel, and Convert them, as He did the *Ephesians* and *Others*: Which the Apostle takes Notice of in the following Verse. And as this Proposition is not Contrary to Scripture, so it can be Proved from it; but this is not the proper Place for it. From the whole I Conclude, that this Proposition is not Relevant.

P R O P. IV. *If the Heathen would seek after the Way, how God is Reconciled, he would Discover it to them.*

What I say is, *If the Heathen would in Sincerity and Truth, and in the Diligent use of the Means, that Providence lays to their Hands, seek from God the Knowledge of the way of Reconciliation necessary for their acceptable serving of him, and being saved by him, he would discover it to them.*

This Proposition Mr. W. does not alledge to be Contrary to any part of Scripture, or our Confession; and therefore I may pass it, as not being Relevant. Only he says, *that if this were true, then the making known the Remedy to some Heathen Nations,*

Nations, and not to others, may be, because the one sought after the Way, and the other did it not; I grant, it is a thing possible: But that ever any Nation, among the Heathen, did thus seek after it, and obtain it this Way, is what I have not Read in any History, Sacred or Civil: On the contrary, the *New Testament* tells us, that God Prevented the Heathen in Sending the Gospel to them, when not seeking it, and so was Found of them that Sought him not. Altho' I think, God will not deny his Grace to them that seek it in the way mentioned, yet I do not think, that he will give it to none but such as seek it that way, and that he does not prevent Sinners, both with the Knowledge, and Grace of the Gospel, especially Nations; And so far as Mr. *Rutherford* Refutes this, I fully Agree with him: But if he should be thought to Refute this, or any of the former Propositions as Explained by me, which is a matter not proper here to be debated, Mr. *W.* may find, that there are Divines as famous for Piety and Learning as Mr. *Rutherford*, who have taught the same things that I do; Some of whose words I shall add, that it may appear, that in these Propositions I do not Teach Novelties.

1st. Our Confess. ch. 21. § 1. says, "The Light of Nature sheweth, that there is a God, who hath Lordship and Sovereignty over all, is Good, and doth Good unto all, and is therefore to be Feared, Loved, Praised, Called upon, Trusted in, and Served with all the Heart, Soul and Might. Now, I would fain know from Mr. *W.* or any body else, if Gods Goodness unto All, made known by the Light of Nature, does oblige

E

Men

Men to Call on God and Trust in Him, only for Temporal Favours; Or if it doth not also Oblige them Chiefly to Call upon him, and Trust in Him for Spiritual Blessings, such as, Pardon of Sin, Renovation of Heart and Life; which it cannot do, unless this Goodness of God give some Obscure Hint, at least, of his being Reconcilable to Sinners in a Way Agreeable to his Infinit Perfections, which if it do, it will Oblige all Men in the first place to Call upon Him, and Trust in Him, for a Sufficient Discovery of this Way of Salvation.

Next, I Name the Pious and Learned Dr. Owen, who, in his *Exercitations* prefixed to his *Commentary* on the *Epistle to the Hebrews*, vol. 1. *Exercise* 8. § 28. tells us, 'That all the false Worship of the World was laid in a General Persuasion, that there was a Way for the Recovery of the Favour of God, while Men did not know what it was. And § 79. 'To what End shall we conceive the Providence and Patience of God to be exercised toward the Race of Mankind, for so long a Season in the Earth? And a little below he says, "But to suppose that God hath no other Design at all, but merely by his Patience, to Forbear them a while their Folly, and then to Avenge himself upon them, is Unfutable to his Wisdom and Goodness. And a little below, "God hath been pleased to require from Men, a Revenue of Glory thereby, by a way of Worship prescribed unto them after the Entrance of Sin; this he hath not done unto the Angels that Sinned, nor could it have been done in a Consistency with Righteousness unto Men, without a Supposition of the

" Possibility

“ Possibility of Deliverance from under his Wrath;
 “ for in every Prescription of Duty, God propos-
 “ eth Himself as a Rewarder, which he is only
 “ to them that Please him; and, to Please God,
 “ without the Deliverance Enquired after, is Im-
 “ possible.

The next I mention is the Learned *Witsius*.
OEcon. Foed. L. 3. Cap. 5 § 7. Externa vocatio ali-
quatenus peragitur verbo Naturæ. And § 8. Sed mul-
tis modis inclamat Homini, ut Rerum Terrenarum
et hujus vitæ Animalis nimia Cura, Cultuque
Objecto, ad Meliora, Cælestia, AEterna, anbelet;
 Which he Elegantly proves, § 9. *Ita Naturæ voce*
Exhortantur Homines ut Quærent Deum, si forte
Palpando ipsum Invenire queant Act. 17, 27. Non
Enim patitur se Expertem esse Testimonii bona tri-
buendo, Act. 14, 17. Atque ita ostendendo se bono-
rum omnium fontem Maximum simul Optimum-
que esse. § 10. Neque modo ad Quærendum sese
Deus per Naturam invitat homines, sed et aliquam
viæ potiundi spem suppeditat. Which he Proves
 from the Long-suffering and Patience of God towards
 sinners, and Confirms by 2 Pet. 3, 9. and Con-
 cludes, *Atque hæc Divinæ Patientiæ----- considera-*
re, uti spem aliquam salutis suppeditat, Domini-
que Nostri tarditas ad Iram pro salute duci debet,
 2 Pet. 3, 15. *Ita benignitas hæc Dei ad Resipis-*
centiam quemvis debebat deducere. Rom. 2. 4.

This Objective Call of Nature he Proves and
 illustrates further from several Texts of Scrip-
 ture and Testimonys of Heathen Writers, § 11, 12.
 and shews, that it is not so much as Objectively
 sufficient to Salvation; and Rejects the Opinion
 of the Pelagians, and Amyrald, and other French

Divines upon this Head, § 13, 14. Shewing, that it is sufficient to render Men Inexcusable, tho' not sufficient of it self for their Salvation: In all which I fully Agree with him. And § 15. *Exservit ista vocatio ut viam sternat ulteriori, perfectiori et magis explicitæ vocationi quæ fit per Evangelium.* And a little below, *Ubi quis sub Malignæ naturæ luce conspicatus fuerit esse Deum, et in illius Communionem Sitam esse Beatitudinem, et omnia præ ipso Nihil esse, et ipsum Remuneratorem esse iis quæ ipsum quærent, nec quæri frustra, modo via & ratio quærat; is ea jam fundamenta habet quibus superædificat Evangelium.*

From which Testimonies Mr. Webster may see that there are some Learned and Orthodox Divines, not wholly Strangers to Polemick Divinity, who Explain *Acts* 14. 17. and 17. 27. and *Rom* 2. 4. in a Sense that favours my Opinion, which they also Maintained and have Taught and Printed without being Libelled. I hope, he will also here find an Answer to his Objection, 'How can we know without a particular Revelation from GOD that a Remedy is provided for Sin, seeing it is an Act of his free Will?' And in Case these Citations do not satisfy Him, I desire he may read the mentioned *Exercit.* of Dr. Owen. I hope, he may also be Convinced, that My Opinion in these Propositions is no more *Arminian* than the Opinion of Owen and *Witfius*.

I therefore Conclude that this Article in all its Branches is Irrelevant; And that the first Article of the Additional Libel, in so far as it differs from what I have Owned above to be My Opinion, is False: And the Expressions in which it is conceived are not Mine.

Answer

Answer to *Article II of Libel and Addit. Libel.*

THis Article Charges Me with a Fault in *Dislik-
ing both the Supralapsarian and Sublapsa-
rian Way of Ranging in Order the Decrees
of God about Mans Election and Reprobation.*

Our Confession follows neither of them, but ab-
stracts from both: And Dr. Owen Vol. 2. on Heb.
Exercit. 2. P. 20. Says, *Both these Schemes are
exposed to insuperable Difficulties*, and therefore
proposes a Third that is truly a Mixture of Both,
which he thinks the Best, as I do; and therefore
Teach and Recommend it to the Students: And
our Divines generally say, the Debates about the
Order of Gods Decrees are of little Moment, if
there be nothing else at bottom; I am therefore
perswaded, Mr. Webster would have forborn this
Article unless his Informer had given him a very
indistinct and False Account of My Opinion, and
therefore as it stands in the Libel, I deny it ei-
ther to be My Expressions, or the Sense of what
I Teach. As for Example, He says,

1st, *In the Predestination of others, to the Illu-
stration of the Glory of Mercy, they are not only
considered as miserable Sinners, but also as in-
vested with all these Qualities, which make them
meet for the Illustration of the Glory of Mercy.*

This Proposition is not Mine, nor can I make any
Sense of it.

2ly. The Account given of the Way, how I
Order the Parts of the Decree of Election, is far
from the Way I Teach; And the 2d part of it is a
Proposition that I never Taught, nor Held: It is this,

They being considered, as thus made meet for the Illustration of his Glory and Mercy, he predestinated them for that very end ; Which is a Proposition that cannot easily be made good Sense. This with many other like Instances, obliges me to take notice here once for all, That, if these Articles, as they stand in the Libel, have been wrote by a Scholar of mine, as they are pretended to be, he has certainly been One, who wanted a Competency either of Common Sense, or Honesty. Or, if he hath given a true Account of what I Teach on these Heads, then certainly some Body void of Sense, or Common Honesty, has reduced them to the Form they now have; Which yet I'm far from Charging on Mr. Webster, who could not have these things but by Information of others; But I do Charge it on some or other who informed him either mediately or immediately.

I Deny also these Propositions in Mr. Webster's Representation.

1st, ' That the Decree of giving Regeneration Grace to most of People, is upon GOD's Fore-sight of their Using the Means, when others do not. (a)

2d. ' That Persons who are Foreseen to Believe, are the Object of Election. (b)

3ly, ' That in My Order of the Decree of Christ and his Merits, is an Incident Proposition. (c)

4tly, ' That CHRIST's Merits are the Meritorious Cause why any is Elected; Which is the 2d Article of the Additional Libel (d). All these

(a) See Page 19. (b) page 19, 20. (c) page 20. (d) ibi

Propositions I Deny, and Challenge him to Prove them, and might leave this Article so, but that I am Willing, Every Body may know what I truly Teach.

First, I take Notice, with the Learned Dr. Over, that There are some Attributes of GOD, which as to their first Exercise ad Extra, require no Object antecedently Existing, much less Objects so or so qualified; Such are the Power and Wisdom of GOD in making the World; and that there are other Properties of GOD, which cannot be Exercised, ad Extra, according to their Nature, without a Supposition of an Antecedent Object, and that Qualified in such or such a Manner; Such are His Vindictive Justice, and His Pardoning Mercy &c. See Vol. 2. Heb. Exerc. 5. §. 9.

2dly, In following that Rule, *Quod primum est in Intentione, ultimum est in Executione*; I consider Two Parts in the Decree; The one Determining the Full and Adequate End; Namely, the Glory of all the Divine Perfections, which are to be Manifested by the whole Works of GOD; The Other Part Comprehends the Full and Adequate Means for Attaining that End; Namely, the whole Works of GOD, Creation, Providence, and Redemption, Relating to Time and Eternity. Which Two Parts make the Complete Object of the Eternal, Free, and Unchangeable Decree of GOD, by which together and at once, both the foresaid End and Means, are Wisely and Righteously Established; So as, the Conceiving the One Part Prior, and the Other Posterior, flows not from any such Way

or

or Order, wherein GOD Decreed them, but from the Imperfection of our Understanding, and the Relation of End and Means, which the Objects of that *One Decree* have to One Another.

3dly, According to this Method, all the Works of God, whether of Creation, Providence, or Redemption, whereby the Infinite Wisdom of God is Glorified, make up the Adequate Means of manifesting the Glory of his Wisdom; And so, in like Manner, these that Glorify his Power, Sovereignty, Justice, Mercy &c, Run through the whole Works of GOD, from the Beginning to the End, and make up the Adequate Means of Glorifying these several Attributes; And sundry of his Attributes Conjunctly, are Glorified by the same Works, as Infinite Wisdom and Power by the Work of Creation; Infinite Love, Justice, Mercy, Wisdom, Power &c. by the Work of Redemption. And as there is a Perfect Harmony among the Attributes of GOD, which He designs to Glorify by his Creatures; So, there is a Perfect Harmony among the several Parts of his Works, which are all Coordinat Means for Manifesting the Glory of his Attributes, tho' many of them have the Nature of End and Means with Respect to One Another.

4ly, According to this Method, That Part of the Decree Relating to Mans Salvation, I conceive Thus.

1st, The Adequate End of the whole Work of Redemption is the Manifestation of all the Divine Perfections discoverable by it; Such as

the Infinite Love, Mercy, Wisdom, Justice, and Holiness of GOD; and particularly the distinct Glory of these and the like Perfections, discovered by the distinct Personal Actions, of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, in the Oeconomy of Mans Salvation; such as, the Love of the Father in Sending His Son to Redeem Sinners; The Love of the Son and the Value of his Merits, with the other Parts of his Mediatorial Glory; and the Love and Power &c. of the Holy Ghost, in Applying what the Son was to Purchase. So that, the Constituting *Christ* Mediator, and Setting what Parts the Father, and the Son, and the Holy Ghost were to Act, in this Oeconomy, belong to the first Part of the Decree. Then 2ly, The Adequate Means of Glorifying these Perfections of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, are all Established and Unchangeably Determined, and their Relations with Respect to One Another, are also Fixed: And the Attributes of GOD, to be manifested by this Part of his Decree, being such as require Objects particularly Qualified, the Objects of it are Considered as duly prepared, by the Exercise of these other Attributes of GOD, which require no Preexistent or Qualified Object, such as Wisdom, Power, Sovereignty, according as determined in another Part of the Decree, that in Order is conceived Prior to this. So, Mankind is Considered as lying in a State of Sin and Misery, from which the Infinite Love, Mercy, and Free Grace of GOD in *Christ* alone can Relieve him, and thereby is a fit Object, by which GOD may display the Glory of his Excellent Perfections, mentioned in the

the former Part of this Decree of Man's Salvation. For the Manifestation of which, he first Chuses a Certain Number out of the Corrupt Mass of Sinfull Mankind, Equally Sinful and Miserable as the Rest, whom he gives to the Son, Appointed Mediator, to be Saved by Him; whereby the Infinite Free Love of GOD the Father is Glorified in Chusing them to Salvation; And the Love and Kindness of the Son, in Undertaking to Satisfy for them.

Therefore, the Election of some to Salvation, must needs be Subordinat to the Constituting of Christ Mediator; it being a Means to Manifest his Mediatory Glory in all its Branches, and seems to be intended by the *Apostle*, *Eph. i. 4.* According as he hath chosen us in him before the foundation of the World. & v. 5. Having Predestinated us unto the Adoption of Children, by Jesus Christ. Where, being Chosen in him, does not at least only import our being Chosen to be Saved by Him, as the Means of our Salvation; But, In him, as Designed Mediator, and Head of such as GOD should Chuse to Salvation; For the promoting of whose Honour, and the Glory of his Infinite Love, Mercy, Merit, Justice, Wisdom and Power, &c, they are Chosen; Importing as much as, in Subordination to him, and for him. Thus *Joan. Crocius* expounds these Words, Chosen in him, in his *Comment on Eph.* wherein he follows the *Helvetic Confession*, so much esteemed by the Church of Scotland; which says, ch. 10, § 2. *Ergo non sine medio, licet non propter ullum meritum nostrum, sed in Christo et propter Christum, nos Elegit Deus.* And *Professor Marck*, in his *Medulla*, which

Teach

Teach, speaking of *Christs Predestination*, says, *Vel potest nostræ præordinari ob dignitatem Christi, et Gloriæ ejus; vel illi subordinari, ut Medium exsequendæ nostræ Electionis.* Both which I think true in different respects; The former, in the respect and sense just now mention'd: And this is all that I either Hold or Teach, about *Christs being the Cause of Election*; and it is all I mean by the Passage of My Letter to Mr. Rowan, of March 20. 1713. Where I say, *that Respect to Christs Merit, is the Cause why any are Elected, tho' not the Cause, why this Man is Elected rather than another.* I do not say, *Christs Merit is the Cause of Election* (which is commonly understood of its being the *Meritorious Cause*) but say, *that Respect unto Christs Merit, Meaning the Glorifying thereof, is the Cause, namely the final Cause, why any are Elected*; and this I touch only in the least by, a little to Remove Mr. Romans Mistake, until I should have occasion, to write My Mind fully to him about it, according to the Design proposed in My Letter to him, of Nov. 21. 1711. And so Mr. Webster may know, that *Christs being the Meritorious Cause of Election, is as little My Opinion as His*; On the Contrary, I take care to Refute it Yearly, and Warn the Students to Beware of Confounding *Christs being the Meritorious Cause, with His being the Final Cause*; and tell them that *the Glory of his Infinite Merit, is a part of the Final Cause.* Which, I hope, Mr. Webster will allow to be Evident, from the Apostles *solid Metaphysicks*, as he calls them, Rom. 11. 36. *For of him and through him and to him are all things.* Next we are to consider, as placed in this

this part of the Decree, all these Means, by which the Salvation of the Elect, is to be brought about, and the forementioned Divine Attributes are to be Glorified; Such as the Incarnation, Obedience, Sufferings, Death and Resurrection of CHRIST, and His Executing all the Parts of His Mediatorial Office, all Gospel Ordinances, before and after his Coming, with all the particular Means Ordinary and Extraordinary, whereby each Particular Elect Sinner is to be Converted, together with all the particular Privileges, and Degrees of Grace, to be conferred on them in Time, with the Glory they are to receive hereafter, and whatever relates thereunto: Which Benefits are commonly distinguished into these Two, *Grace* and *Glory*.

5ly, Although Grace and Glory (wherein our Salvation is Summed up) when considered with respect to us, and compared between themselves, have the Relation of Means and End, Grace being the Means to Fit us for, and make us Capable of Inheriting Glory as our Last End; Yet, if they be considered with respect to GOD, they are Conjunct and Coordinate Means for Glorifying His Infinite Mercy, Righteousness and Holiness &c. Therefore, according to our Imperfect Way of Conceiving the Order of GODs Decrees One after Another, altho' they be all Simultaneous with respect to Him, we must conceive these Means in such an Order, as may best Represent to us the Glory of these Attributes that are to be Manifested by them.

Now, as I have said, the Elect being considered in the Decree of Election, as Miserable Sinners, whom

whom GOD designs to Save by giving them Grace and Glory in CHRIST; the Order that to Me seems best, is, That GOD first Appoint unto the Elect, all that Grace by which they are made meet for the Inheritance of the Saints in Light; and next, that He Appoint unto them the Possession of Eternal Glory; Because that Act of GODs Sovereign Free Grace, whereby he Appoints a Person unto the Possession of Glory, must be Exercised in a Suitableness to His Infinit Righteousness and Holiness, which cannot allow Sinners, continuing such, and whose Sins are not purged, to dwell with Him: Therefore, if we Conceive GOD to Appoint unto Elect Sinners, all that Grace in CHRIST whereby their Sins are Intirely Purged, both as to their Guilt, Filth, and Inbeing, &c. and that being considered as thus Qualified He Appoints them to the Possession of Glory, Then, this Act of Free Grace will be Exercised in a Suitableness to Righteousness and Holiness; Which it does not Appear it would be, if we consider them first Appointed to the Possession of Glory, while only considered as Miserable Sinners.

This, I suppose, is what Mr. *Websters* Informer has given Him so False a Representation of, and what he would have to be *Predestinating Persons upon their Foreseen Faith, Repentance &c.* and would have to be all one with the *Arminian Notion*; and to be *Contrary to Scripture, Our Confession, and the Canons of the Synod of Dort.* But, by the Representation I have now given, I hope, He, the Presbytery, and any Body else who considers it, will easily perceive, that there is not the least *Apex* of the *Arminian Scheme* in this; And if

Mr.

Mr. Webster understand aright this part of the Arminians Opinion, and our Controversy with them upon the Account of it, He may perceive, that they Deny any Eternal, Unchangeable Decree of GOD appointing a Certain Number of Particular Persons either to Grace or Glory; And that, with Respect to Particular Persons, they allow only, An Incomplete, Not Peremptory Election, upon their Foreseen Faith, Repentance &c. which depend upon the right Exercise of their Own Free-will; And are not Determined by Any Eternal and Unchangeable Decree of GOD; See Canones Dordr. Primum Doctrinæ Caput. Reject. Error. All which Errors I Reject and Refute, and Maintain the same Opposite Doctrine they do; Unless the Conceiving our being Appointed to Grace first, and then to Glory, be thought a Different Opinion from Theirs, which I think it is not; It being a Matter of little or no Moment as to their Scheme, whether we be Chosen First to Grace, and Next to Glory; or First to Glory and Next to Grace; Either of these Agreeing very well with Their Doctrine and That of our own Confession. For, According to My Opinion it is Evident, 'That GOD has, by His Eternal and Immutable Purpose and good Pleasure, 'Chosen in Christ, unto Everlasting Glory, those of 'Mankind, that are Predestinated unto Life, without Any Foresight of Faith &c. or Any other 'Thing in the Creature, as Conditions or Causes, 'Moving Him thereto: For they Neither have nor can have Any Inherent Grace but what is Appointed to them in this Decree, and in Time is Conferred on them, according to the Tenor of it. And so, what I Teach is the very same

with

with the Doctrine of our *Confession* Chap. 3. §. 5, 6. For, according to My Opinion, as Explained above, their Actual Redemption by CHRIST, Effectual Calling, Faith, &c. are all bestowed on them According to the Tenor of this Eternal Decree of Election; In which Decree, the Appointment of all these Means are, in the Order wherein I conceive them, Posterior to Peoples being Elected to *Grace* and *Glory*: And so, According to My Opinion, *Electio est fons omnis Salutiferi Boni, ex qua Fides, Sanctitas &c. fluunt*, as the Synod of *Dort* saith. Wherefore, there is not the least Shaddow of Opposition, and so nothing Relevant in what is My true Opinion; And I Crave, that Mr. *Webster* May be Obligated to Prove the *Arminian* Propositions He has Charged Me with on this Article, or be Censured as I should have been, in Case He had Proved them.

There Remains as yet One Thing in Mr. *Webster's* Representation on this Article, which I must take Notice of; Namely, what he Alledges out of my Letter to Him, in these Words, *That if we use the Means we shall obtain Regenerating Grace. The Decree of giving Regenerating Grace to the Most of People, According to him, is upon GODs Foresight of their Using of the Means, when Others do not.* To which He adds these Words, *His new Model of Predestination makes Persons who are Foreseen to Believe, &c. to be the Object of Election.* I hope, His Mistake with Respect to this last part is Evident, by what I have said above: And, to Convince the Presbytery, how far he Wrongs Me, in what he pretends to Cite out of My Letter, I refer to the Paragraph of My Letter, wherein I say Expressly,

'preſſy, 'That the Gift of the Holy Ghoſt for Re-
 'generating and Converting the Elect is Promiſed
 'to CHRIST in the Covenant of Redemption, on
 'Account of His Perfect Righteouſneſs, whereby
 'this and all other Bleſſings are Purchas'd to them
 'And that in the ſaid Covenant, and the Decree of
 'Election, both the Extraordinary Means, GOD
 'Uſes in Converting ſome, and the Ordinary Means
 'without which none have Reaſon to Expect it
 'are Particularly Condeſcended upon and Determined
 'ed: Whence 'tis plain, that the right Uſe of theſe
 'Means, and the Succeſs of them, cannot be the
 'Fruit of a Mans Free-will, Acting Independently,
 'as the *Pelagians* and *Arminians* fondly Imagine
 'contrary to Scripture and Reaſon; but flow from
 'the Special Favour of GOD, and his Effectual
 'Bleſſing upon the Means of His own Appointment
 'according to the Tenor of the Covenant of Redem-
 'ption and Decree of Election. So that Every Per-
 'ſon whom GOD Enables and Excites to ſeek His
 'Spirit aright, Owes nothing to An *Arminian* Free-
 'Will, but hath GOD to Bleſs for Giving him
 'Counſel, and Effectually bringing about his
 'Aſking &c.

Whence 'tis Evident, that, according to My O-
 pinion, GOD does not Decree to give Regenerating
 Grace, upon the Foreſight of Peoples Uſing
 Means appointed by Him, according to the Li-
 berty of their Free-Will, not Determined to Par-
 ticular Actions by Any Decree of GOD; but, on
 the Contrary, He Decrees to give Regenerating
 Grace to theſe, whom, in the Decree of Election,
 He has Determined, ſhall uſe theſe Means appoint-
 ed by Him, for obtaining thereof, and to whom,

the Use of these Means, He has Determined to give it; so that none but the Elect do Use these Means, and in the Use of them Receive that Grace.

Now, I Leave it to the Presbytery to Judge, whether Mr. Websters Perverting so Grossly the Words of My Letter, flows from a Defect of Understanding, or something Worse: And, I hope, they will Easily perceive, that CHRIST and His Merit is not a *Propositio Incidens* in My scheme; which Mr. Webster might have understood from what is just now Cited out of My Letter, which has been in His hand now near two Years.

Answer to *Libel*, Class I. Article III. and Class II. Art. V: VII. and *Addit. Libel*, Art. XII:

MR. Webster in this Article Charges Me with Maintaining some Propositions, which, tho' not very well Expressed, yet Can bear My meaning: But He Charges Me with other Propositions, which are either Absolutely False; or give a False Idea of My Opinion; which therefore I Disown. I shall begin with putting this rubbish out of the Way; before I speak of My own Opinion.

The 1st Proposition Falsly Alledged is, That Arraign all Orthodox Divines for their Bold Ascribing the Number of the Elect to be Fewer than that of the Reprobate. (a)

G

This

(a) See Represent. I. Error 3. P. 21.

This I Do not, nor Can I; And tho' I Could I Would not, knowing well, that many Orthodox Divines do not Determine this Question.

PROP. II. *That I make CHRIST the Universal Remedy, provided for Jews, Mahometans, & Pagans; and the Covenant of Grace to Extend to them, and Include them: Which is the Sentiment of Arminians, Apolog. Remonst. Fol. 86. 87. (b)*

Now, to Clear what Mr. Webster means by this Proposition, I must set down the Sentiments of the Arminians, about the *Universality of the Remedy for Sin*, in the place Cited: They say, 1st, Fol. 86. in fine, *That Christ is the Universal Remedy by which GOD Designed or Intended to Save Mankind, altho' in the Event they be not all Saved*. This is so far from being Maintained by Me, that I Yearly Refute it. 2ly, They say, Fol. 87. *That GOD Could not in Justice Condemn Infants for Original Sin; Which is also an Error that I Refute; and His Libel Owns, that I Deny*. 3ly, They say, *that Infants are Incapable of Regeneration, and Call them Innocent; by which they seem to Deny the Necessity of Pardon*. Both which I Refute, and Teach, that No Infants Can be Saved in a Consistency with the Holiness and Righteousness of GOD, unless they be Regenerated and Saved by CHRIST through the Spirit, Seeing, for Original Sin Only, they need both Pardon and Sanctification, and are Capable of Both, and must have Both, else they Cannot be Saved. So Mr. Webster has Falsely Charged

and Me with *Arminian* Sentiments on this Head, and I Challenge Him to Prove, that so much as One of these *Arminian* Propositions is Held by Me.

This 2d Proposition is also Capable of this Ill sense, viz. That CHRIST is the Universal Remedy for *Jews*, &c. who shall be Saved by Him, if they live Honestly, according to the Rules of their Respective Religions. This also is a Gross Error, which I Refute.

PROP. III, That None are Excluded from the Benefits of the Covenant, but those, who in their own Persons Exclude themselves. In His Representation He hath it thus, So far Universal is the Redemption and Covenant of Grace, that none shall want the Distinguishing Blessings of them, who do not by Actual Sinning Exclude themselves. (c) This is not a Distinct and True Account of my Opinion: What I say, shall be shown in its own place afterwards.

PROP. IV. Punishing in Hell for Original Sin only, Cannot be Reconciled to the Justice and Goodness of GOD. (d)

PROP. V. GOD, that He might not be Unjust or Cruel for Executing the Sanction of the Covenant of Works, He was Obligated of Necessity to make a Covenant of Grace. (e)

For Proof of these Two Propositions He Acknowledges My Letters to Mr. Rowan. To which I Answer, 1st, That, I suppose, Mr. Webster or any other Minister

Minister of this Church would think themselves Hardly dealt with, if they had brought against them in Judgement all such things as might be pick'd out of Letters, that have pass'd between them and their Intimate Comrades, wherein, for Clearing of Truth, they Propose such Objections or Answers, about Points of Divinity as Occurred to them, which may be very Different from what is their Fixed Opinion: Wherefore, I might justly Decline this Sort of Proof as being Unjust; Yet there being Nothing in My *Letters* to Mr. Rowan, so far as I Remember, of which I need be Ashamed (tho' most of them were Wrote off Hand, and in such hast that I had Scarce time to Glance them over) I shall Admit this Evidence: Only I Wish, Mr. *Webster* had Cited the Letter, in which these Propositions are Contained, and had Inserted My own Words: For after looking over My Copys of them (f), I can find no such Propositions as He Alledges. 2ly, What, I guess, He aims at, may be a Passage of My Letter, *January* 14. 1712, towards the End, where, after having Explained the Imputation of *Adams* Sin to his Posterity, I Propose the Grand *Pelagian* Objection against it, in these Words. 'The only Difficulty of Moment that presseth it, *which lyes heavier against the Federal Way*, is, to Account for the Goodness and Righteousness of GOD towards the Souls of *Adams* Posterity; which are all Pure as they Come from their Creators Hands, yet by being

United

(f) I got only one of these Letters Transcribed before sending them to Mr. Rowan. The rest I got but at the third Hand.

United to the Bodies Procreated from Fallen Man, are, without any Sinfull Act or Fault of their Own, by Sovereign Power, put in a Condition wherein they become Necessarily Polluted with Sin, and Incapable of doing Good, and so made liable to Eternal Wrath. In which Words it is Manifest, that I do not so much as Insinuate, that Punishment in Hell for Original Sin Only Cannot be Reconciled to the Justice and Goodness of GOD; I only say, this is a Difficulty that Presses the Imputation of Adams Sin to his Posterity, and, Consequently, GODs Way of Dealing with their Souls, whether the Imputation be Explained by the Federal Way or Mine. And all our Divines who maintain this Imputation, whom I have Read, Own this to be a great Difficulty; Myself, that I can find Nothing that looks like the former of these Propositions, Alledged out of My Letters to Mr. Rowan:

As to the Other Proposition alledged out of them, I can find no such Thing in them. What He seems to Aim at, I Guess to be this Proposition; ' There had been no Propagation of Mankind after the Fall, unless a Remedy for Sin had been Provided; Which Proposition Mr. Rowan had formerly Quarrelled, and which I tell him, in the Letter just now Cited, did help to take off the Force of the forementioned Objection. And for the Truth of the Proposition I say to Him, If you read over again the 3 and 4 Chapters of Genes. You will find, that it (Namely My Proposition) asserts only what is there said to be done by GOD, which therefore must be Agreeable to his Will, and is only the Accom-

phismment of His Eternal Decree: And therefore it can be no great Error, at least, to say, a Thing was not to be Otherways, then According as GOD had Decreed and Done it. And I think it can be Demonstrated, both from Scripture and Reason, that it could not be otherwise in this Case altho' the like cannot be said of All that GOD does

Now, It is plain, that I say here no such thing as Mr. Webster alledges; Namely, *That GOD, that He might not be Unjust or Cruel in Executing the Sanction of the Covenant of Works, was Obligated of Necessity to make a Covenant of Grace* Whereas, I only say, *That GOD would not have Suffered the Propagation of Mankind, after the Fall, unless a Remedy for Sin had been Provided and Proposed; and that, I think, it can be Proved, that it could not be otherwise in this Case* In which Opinion I am not Alone; For, the Pious and Learned Dr. Owen says as much, in the forecited *Exerc. 8. on Hebr. Vol. 1. P. 79.* In these Words. '2dly, To what End shall we
' Conceive the Providence and Patience of GOD
' to be Exercised towards the Race of Mankind
' for so long a Season on the Earth?----- But to
' suppose, that GOD hath no other Design at all
' but meerly by His Patience to Forbear them
' a while in their Folly, and then to Avenge Himself
' self upon them, is Unsutable unto His Wisdom
' and Goodness. And below, P. 85. §. 23. Speaking of the first Gospel Promise, He says, 'there be not a Promise of Deliverance expressed
' in these Words, Whence is it that the Execution
' of the Sentence of Death against Sin is suspended
' Unless we will allow an Intervention satisfactory to
' the Righteousness and Truth of GOD, to be expressed

fed in these Words, there would have been a Truth in the Suggestion of the Serpent, namely, that whatever GOD had said, yet indeed they were not to Die. See also *Vol. 2 on Hebr. Ex-rc. 5. §. 9. Pag. 68.* Where he speaks to the same Purpose. Whence it is Plain, that, according to Dr. Owens Opinion and Mine, GOD might have justly Inflicted on Adam and Eve the Punishment Threatned, yea, by the Sanction of his Law, had Obligated Himself so to do; But, in Supposition, that GOD Designed to Delay the Execution and Allow Adam and Eve to propagate Posterity, and put them in a New state of Trial, in this Case we both say, that the Proposing a Remedy for Sin, or a Covenant of Grace, was Necessary. In which Assertion there is Nothing Arminian, No Insinuation; That GOD annexed to His Law a Punishment He would not justly Inflict; Nor the least undue Reflection on the Wisdom and Justice of GOD, for annexing to His Law, a Sanction that He could not Execute, without Injury to his Justice and Goodness; Nor any Thing Contrary to the Freedom and Riches of His Grace: Neither is there in it any Thing Contrary to our Confession and Catechisms, asserting The Sinfulness and Misery of our State to follow Justly our First Fall: But, on the Contrary, what serves to Confirm the Truths they Teach, and to Refute the Arminian Errors, mentioned Apolog. Remonst. Fol. 87.

PROP. VI. *That the Covenant of Grace is made with Jews, Turks, and Pagans (g)* This is Comprehended in his Second Proposition, and I Deny it, as above.

G 4

PROP.

PROP VII. He Insinuates (*b*) That I deny the Extent of the Covenant of Works to all Mankind. But, on the Contrary, I Assert, with Orthodox Divines, the Extent of the Covenant of Works to all Mankind; Yet, with several of the best of them, I Deny, that it was a Covenant Properly so taken, in the strict Sense of Lawyers.

PROP. VIII. Pursuant to this Universal Covenant of Grace the Children of Infidels may be Baptised (*i*).

This Proposition, as here Expressed, I Deny. What my Opinion is about it, will be seen in the other Part, to which I now Proceed.

PROPOSITIONS that I Own.

PROP. I. Many of our Divines do too Boldly Determine, the Elect to be Fewer in Number than the Reprobate, seeing the Scripture is Silent in this Matter. The Texts adduced by our Author, viz. *Marckius*, do not prove his Assertion; Namely, *Mat. 20. 16. & Mat. 7. 13, 14.* The Words of the former are, *Many are Called, but Few are Chosen.* The Words of the latter, *Enter in at the strait Gate; for strait is the Gate, and narrow is the Way &c.* In which places, our Lord is speaking of these who are Outwardly Called by the Gospel, and are Commanded to Enter in at the strait Gate, of whom Few are Chosen, and find the strait Gate and narrow Way. Now

(*b*) Ibid. page 23. (*i*) Ibid. page 24.

It is manifest, that such a Call and Command can Agree to none but Adult Persons, that are capable of them. Wherefore, these Words, *Strait is the Gate, and narrow is the Way, and Few there be that find it*, cannot without an undue Stretch, contrary to the proper Meaning of our Lords Words, be extended to all Mankind in general. This is confirmed by Luke 13. 23, 24. Where our Lord waves Answering that Curious Question, *Are there Few that be Saved?* And Exhorts the Enquirer, to take Care of his own Salvation, by *Striving to enter in at the strait Gate, before the Door were shut.*

That My Sense of this Place is not Singular, will appear from *Confess. Helvet. Chap 10. §. 4. in fine. Et cum rogaretur Dominus, an pauci sint qui salventur? Non respondet Dominus ac dicit paucos aut plures fore servandos aut perdendos; sed portatur potius, ut quisque contendat ingredi per portam arctam, quasi dixerit, Vestrum non est de his curiosius inquirere, sed magis anniti ut per rectam viam Cælum ingrediamini.* And, I Humbly think, it is too great Boldness in any Divine, positively to Determine a Question which our Lord himself would not Determine; Therefore I do not pretend to Determine it, altho' I tell what seems to me most Probable about it, and even this much I would not do, did I not find sundry of our Divines determining *that Fewer are saved*, which says our Doctrine open to Objections of Adversaries, that are not very easy to be Answered. I know also, that a good many Orthodox Divines, are not for Determining this Question more than of whom appear to be the Authors of the

Helvet.

Helvet Confess. and these who Received it; Among whom were the *Ministers of Scotland*; And there is nothing Determined about it in our *Confessions* and *Catechisms*. When therefore Mr *Webster* says, *This his Error Contradicts the Scriptures* (k), if he mean, that *My being against the Determining this Question* is an Error, his Charge reaches our *Confession and Catechisms* no less than Me.

But perhaps, what he calls an Error here, is *My Asserting*, that, Probably, *Moe are Saved than Damned*; Which he thinks Contrary to Scripture. This leads to

P R O P. II. *I Think it Probable, that of the Whole Race of Mankind Moe are Elect and Saved than Reprobat and Damned.*

Which Opinion if Mr. *Webster*, or any Body else, shall shew me to be Contrary to Scripture, I shall forthwith Reject it.

What Mr. *Webster* offers from Scripture against it, is, That the Scripture tells, *The Elect are a Little Flock*. I wish, He had named the place where it says so, for I cannot find any such thing in My Bible. I know, our Lord says, *Luk. 12. 32.* (to his Disciples and other Believers present) *Fear not Little Flock*. The Elect, or Believers among his Hearers, being Unquestionably a *Little Flock*; But, to Extend this to the Whole Elect of God, through all Ages and Nations, is not to Expound, but to Wrest Scripture: On the Contrary, when the Scripture Speaks of the Glorious Company of the Redeemed, it calls them a Great Multitude which no Man could Number, *Rev. 7. 9.* and these over and above 144000 Sealed. The

After Scripture, he adds, is, *That Few are Chosen.*
The whole Sentence is, *Many are Called, But Few are Chosen*; Which is only Twice in the whole Bible, Matt. 20, 16. and 22, 14. Spoken by our Lord on Different Occasions, and (according to the Opinion of some Learned Interpreters, whom Mr. W. will Own to be Orthodox) in very Different Senses. Yet, in neither of them Can they be Applied to the Whole Race of Mankind that are Elect or Reprobate, but only to such as are Outwardly Called by the Word, as I said above. But says Mr. Webster, *This Sense is Contrary to the Current Exposition of Orthodox Divines*: To which I reply,
1st, That I Wish, Mr. Webster had either Described, or given a List of these Orthodox Divines, that they may be Known, seeing he often Insinuates, that we are to Follow Their Authority, in what is Truth or Error; And also, by this Objection it seems, Their Current Exposition of Scripture must needs be Followed: If not, Why is this Objection made? But, if Their Current Exposition Must be Followed, Then We have got a fine Rule of Interpreting Scripture, which is more Absurd than the Popish, unless They can be Consecrated Infallible: But, untill this be done, I may, without any fault, Recede from their Exposition, as oft as I find, their Reasons are not Cogent. I wish, Mr. Webster would Reconcile the Principle he here Insinuates, and whence he draws his Objection, with our Confession Chap. 1. §. 9. 10. And, while he pretends so much Fervent Zeal for Truth, I Wish He may take Care, of following in Practice, and Introducing into this Church, some of the most Dangerous Popish Errors; such as,
Making

making the Authority of Men, whether Good or Bad, Orthodox or Heterodox, the Rule of Interpreting Scripture, and of Truth and Error in Matters of Religion.

2dly, I cannot find, after all, that the Sense I have given of these Passages of Scripture, is Contrary to the Current Exposition of all the Divines whom we Esteem Orthodox; Yea, scarce any, I have occasion to Consult, Incline at all to Mr *Websters* Sense of them; And, if he please to Consult his Criticks and Commentators, He will find they Differ about the Sense of them. I shall add the Opinion of One or Two of them. *Calvin* is doubtless an Orthodox Divine, who Expounds *Matt. 20, 16.* thus. "*Sic Novissimi erunt Primi*" "Non confert nunc Judæos Gentibus, ut alibi, nec Reprobos qui a fide deficiunt Electis qui perseverant; itaque minime quadrat, quæ a quibusdam inferitur sententia, *multi vocati, pauci electi.*" So that, he Rejects this Sentence, as not genuine Scripture in this Place: And in his Commentary on the Parallel place *Matt. 22. 14.* He says, "*Neque enim Christus nuper denunciavit majorem partem ejectum iri, sed unius tantum meminit: Hic vero audimus paucos ex magno numero retentum iri, et certe quum hodie plures Evangelii voce in Ecclesiam Congregentur, quam olim per Legem, exigua portio vitæ novitate fidem suam approbat.*" And a little below, "*Hic de Æterna Dei Electione altius non disputo, quia non alio spectant verba Christi, quam externam fidei Professionem minime sufficere, ut pro suis Deus agnoscat, quicumque videntur nomen vocationi ejus dedisse.*" Where it is plain, he understands this only of Adult Per-

sons,

sons, and is against understanding it of Elect and Reprobate in General.

Gomarus, I hope, will also be allowed to be another Orthodox Divine, who, in his Commentary on this last passage, Matt. 22: 14. Says, *Nam vocatos multos sed ex vocatis iis paucos electos*--- ideoque, quod de unius ex vocatis è Gentibus damnatione dictum est, illud non de unico tantum homine intelligendum est, sed de tota Hypocritarum multitudine, sub unius exemplo adumbrata. Whence it is plain, he understands it of Persons Adult and Outwardly Called, and is far from Extending it to the whole Elect and Reprobate. The same Learned Author in his Commentary on Matt. 20. 16. Blames Calvin for rejecting the Passage, for not Agreeing to the Parable, as he thought; Of which he says. *In eo inquam duplex apparet Hallucinatio, prima est, quod eam Sententiam hoc loco non a Christo, sed a quibusdam insertam ait, contra Codicum &c. Fidem.* Altera Hallucinatio est, quod ait *hanc Sententiam minime quadrare.* And he understands here both by the Called and Chosen, True Believers, in these Words, *Christus enim loquitur de vere Fidelibus, qui ad Opera Fidei & Vitæ Eternæ Hæreditatem vocati, eam consequuntur suorum Ultimi erunt Primi, & Primi Ultimi:* According to Matt. 19. 30. And expounds this Phrase thus. *Multi quidem sunt ad vivam Fidem & Hæreditatem Vitæ Eternæ vocati, sed pauci eorum ad eum Honorem a DEO sunt Dilecti, ut in communis Vitæ Eternæ Consecutione, Gloriæ gradu sint Primi.* The Reason of which he gives in the preceding Page; *Cujus Discriminis Occasio est, quod et Operis Duração primis sint minores; majores*

*res tamen Animæ Demissione, seu Humilitate ex-
titerunt.* Which having Explained, he Concludes,
*Ut enim DEUS humilibus dare Gratiam solet
sic humilioribus majorem.* I could adduce Abun-
dance of other Commentators, that run Cross Mr
Websters Interpretation of these Words, *Many
are Called, but Few are Chosen,* were it needfull
And I know none that takes the Former in His
Sense, viz. *Fear not Little Flock.*

PROP. III. Mr. Webster Charges it upon Me
as an Error, ' That I make the Covenant of Grace
' even as to its Great and Distinguishing Bless-
' ings, Deliverance from Hell, and Giving Hea-
' ven, to Belong to all Baptized Infants who
' Die in their Infancy without Actual Sin, and
' make Baptism to Seal these Blessings; tho' it
' is Certain, the most of them are Children of
' Unconverted Parents; for Few Adult are Cho-
' sen.

My Opinion is,

1st, That Baptism is to every Baptized Person
a Sign and Seal of the Covenant of Grace, and
of all its Valuable Blessings, Pardon, Holiness
and Glory, of which it is the Outward Seal, even
to the Reprobate who are Baptized, and renders
them more Inexcusable than Infidels.

2^{ly}, The Efficacy of Baptism is not Tyed to
that Moment of Time wherein it is Administred
Yet, the Grace Promised, is not only Offered, but
really Exhibited and Conferred on such (whether
of Age or Infants) as that Grace Belongeth un-
to, in GODs Time and Way. This is the

Plain

Plain Doctrine of our *Confession and Catechisms*;
 And therefore, I am Surprized, to find the Zea-
 lous and Reverend Mr. *Webster* Blame Me for
 this Doctrine: His Reason for so doing is yet
 more Strange; Namely, *That most of them are*
Children of Unconverted Parents: Which cannot,
 be easily Reconciled with the Doctrine of our
Confession and Catechisms, according to which,
 the Sealing is One Thing, and the Conferring the
 Grace Sealed Another Thing, which Grace may
 be Conferred either before, or after, or at the
 Time of Sealing; and there is no Difference as
 to the Sealing, and Conferring the Grace, whe-
 ther the Parents be Converted or Not. I wish
 Mr. *Webster* may clear this Piece of His Divinity
 from Error.

3dly, I think, that Baptized Infants, Dying
 in Infancy, are Probably of the Number of the
 Elect, on whom, therefore, before their Death, GOD
 Confers the Gracious Blessings of the Covenant
 Signified and Sealed in their Baptism, which is
 most Agreeable to the Gracious Nature of GOD,
 and Tenor of the Covenant of Grace, and No-
 thing in Scripture, that I know, shews that any
 of them are Reprobate: Wherefore, the Probabi-
 lity lies on the Favourable Side. And to shew,
 that My Opinion is not Singular, (which some
 might reckon a Crime) I shall Cite the Words
 of that Learned and Orthodox Divine *Walaus*
Loc. Com. de Effect. Prim. Pecc. Quod vero ad
Liberos Fidelium attinet, Quæstio proprie non
est de Circumcisis aut Baptisatis, quia de omnibus
illis confitendum, ex DEI & CHRISTI Promis-
sione & Obfignatione facta per Baptismum, eos
Servari

Servari si in Infantia moriantur. Which he proves from *Luk.* 18. 16. and *Matt.* 18. 4. To whom I add the Words of the Famous *Piſſet*, Present Professor of Divinity at *Geneva*, who, in his *Christian Theology*, Published in French, *Lib.* 15. *Chap.* 17. at the End, Speaking of Infants; says, 'There is a Fourth Order of Persons that are Baptized, who Die soon after their Baptism; With Respect to them we say, that their Baptism is to them an Authentick Declaration that GOD hath Pardoned their Sin, and given them a Right to Life. To which I could add Others; were it Needfull. Now, is it not a sad Loss to the Church of *Christ*; that there was not formerly at *Leyden*, and that there is not now at *Geneva*, a Zealous Mr. *Webster*, to Prosecute Professors, for Teaching such an Error, as Positively to Determine, that *All Baptized Infants Dying in Infancy are Saved*: Seeing, in his Account, it is a Gross and highly Censurable Error in Me, to say, *It is very Probable, Or, if He pleases, More than Probable, they are Saved.*

PROP. IV. I Think, we should Judge Charitably, and Hope the Best of the Children of Heathens, and other Infidels who Die in Infancy; It being very Agreeable to the Nature of Our Gracious GOD, and the Tenor of the Gospel Covenant, to Apply the Benefits of it; to all of them who Die in Infancy; *By Regenerating and Saving them by Christ, through the Spirit*, in the same Way that he Saves the Infants of Believing Parents; For, altho' GOD has in his Word given several Privileges to these last, beyond the former, yet He has nowhere in Scripture, that I know, Excluded the Children

Children of Infidels Dying in Infancy *from the Benefit of Christs Purchase*; And it is manifest, that if He should Deny His Saving Grace to all, or any of them, he would deal more severely with them, than He did with the Fallen Angels; which we ought not to suppose that GOD does, unless it were plainly taught in his Word. Now, seeing there is but One Way of Saving Sinners, namely by *Jesus Christ*, according to the Tenor of the Covenant of Grace, and that it is Inconsistent with the Holiness and Justice of GOD, to Save Guilty Polluted Sinners (such as all Infants come of Fallen Adam are) Except by this One and Sufficient Way of Salvation; These Infants of Heathens must be either Saved *this Way*, or Perish eternally. But, as I said, this being a Piece of Severity no where Insinuated in Scripture, that I know, which, on the Contrary, Declares Gods tender Mercies are over all His Works, that the Earth is full of His Goodness, that His Mercy reacheth to the Heavens, I think it more probable that they are all Saved; and do think, this Opinion can bear no worse Construction, than that it is an Excess of Charity. And that it may be seen, I am not Singular in it, I shall cite the Words of a Famous Divine, whom I hope Mr. Webster will own to be Orthodox, viz. *Franciscus Junius in Collat. de Nat. & Grat. Exam. Rat. 28. Col. 332. 333.* Who says, *Infantes igitur omnes secundum meritum damnabiles esse dicimus, Justitia Dei.* And below, *Ex charitate autem eos, quos ad se Infantes vocat, & tempestive ex hac misera valle peccatorum eripit, potius servari presumimus, secundum Electionem & Providentiam ipsius Paternam, quam a*

Regno Cælorum abdicari. Omnino conquiescimus in consilio ejus. I wish, Mr. Webster may Read the whole Paragraph.

But Mr. Webster alledges, this is Contrary to our Confession, Chap. 10. § 3. Where the Words are, *Elect Infants dying in Infancy are Regenerated and Saved by Christ through the Spirit, who worketh when, and where, and how He pleaseth, &c.* Where I cannot follow Him in his Logick. There are here Two things Determined in Opposition to the *Arminian* Doctrine. 1st, The Manner by which Infants, Dying in Infancy, are Saved, Namely, that they are Regenerated and Saved by CHRIST, through the Spirit; which I also Hold. And I do Teach, in Opposition to the *Arminian* Errors, that such Infants are both Capable of and need both Regeneration and Pardon, and must have both applyed by CHRIST, through the Spirit, else they cannot be Saved. The 2d Thing Determined is, that all Infants thus Saved, are *Elect Infants*; which I also Hold, in Opposition to the *Arminians*: But there is nothing here Determined, about the Question betwixt Mr Webster and Me, viz. Whether or not are all Infants Dying in Infancy *Elected* and *Saved* this Way? The Expressions manifestly abstracting from both Sides of this Question, which the Authors of our Confession had good Reason to take Care of; Seeing from Scripture it cannot be clearly Determined on Either Side, and our Reformed Divines had Different Opinions about it. Therefore, the Determination of it on Either Side, was not proper to be made an Article of Faith.

Now, My Saying, that a Proposition is Probable about

about which our *Confession* Determines nothing at all, cannot in Reason, be Judged Contrary unto it. Wherefore, I Plead, that this Proposition is not Relevant.

His Insinuating, that Children of Infidels; Dying in Infancy, are *Jews*, *Mahometans*, or *Pagans*, is Manifestly Absurd; if by *Jews* &c. be understood their being of the *Jewish*, *Mahometan*, or *Pagan* Religion; which is the Sense it should be taken in, to make it an Objection against My Opinion; unless He think, that the Sins of their Parents, in following these False Religions, are imputed to them, and that they are Damned for them:

PROP. V. Altho' all Mankind be under GOD's curse, and Deserve His Wrath, yet I think it probable, *That none are Excluded from the Benefits of the Remedy for Sin, Provided by GOD; and published Twice to the World, except those who by their Actual Sin Exclude Themselves, and might or Reject, either the Clearer Light of the Gospel Revealed to the Church, or that Obscure Discovery and Offer of Grace, made to all within the Church; according to what I said on Art. 1st.*

Now, this Proposition is a Native Consequence of the Former, and Stands or Falls with them; or, if it be Probable, that all who Die in Infancy, together with such as were never, during their life time Capable of the Outward Means of Grace, are Saved; then it must be also Probable, that none are Damned, but those who are Guilty of Actual Sin. And I Know nothing from Scripture

or Reason, to Prove, that GOD will Exclude any from the Benefits of the Covenant of Grace, who do not by their Actual Sin Exclude themselves. But Mr. *Webster* alledges, this is Contrary to Our *Confession of Faith* Chap. 7. §. 5. 6. wherein are Mentioned *Two Different Administrations* of the Covenant of Grace, and both these Limited to the Church. And here again I am to Learn the Rule of Mr. *Websters* Logick; For, although GOD give only to His Church, a Sufficient Revelation of the Remedy for Sin, and the Outward and Ordinary Means of Applying it; Will it thence follow, that GOD may not, as He pleases, Bestow the Saving Benefits of this Remedy on such, as either With in or Without the Church, are Incapable of Outward Instruction? Further, Will it follow, that GOD has not given by the Light of Nature, and the Works of Creation and Providence, Some obscure Hints unto all Men without the Church, that He is Reconcilable? Or will it follow, that He Cannot, or Will not, Exercise so much Clemency towards these without the Church, as to Exclude None of them, from Access to His Mercy except these who Transgress His Law, and Slightly or Reject this faint Discovery of His Grace. I think, it may be Evident to every Body, that none of these Consequences will hold: And what I say, is very Consistent with these Paragraphs of our *Confession*. So, I plead, this Proposition is not Relevant.

But Mr. *Webster* alledges, It is Gross *Arminianism*, Condemned by Orthodox Divines.

ANSW. I grant, it is an *Arminian* Proposition, to say, That GOD Cannot Justly Condemn

a Person Meerly for Original Sin; Which Error I Disown and Refute. But to say, that Probably GOD Will not Cast any into Hell, meerly for Original Sin, who is Guilty of no Actual Sin; I Deny it to be an *Arminian* Error: On the Contrary, I have shewed above, that it hath been really Maintained by some of the most Eminent of our Orthodox Divines; and I Cannot find it among the Errors Rejected by the Synod of *Dort*: Altho' I Grant it to be a Proposition the *Arminians* maintain, that none Are, or Can be, Justly Condemned by GOD, for what we call Original Sin; Which is far Different from what I say, as I have shewed above.

PROP. VI. The Remedy for Sin and Way of Salvation, were Published Twice to the Whole World; First, In *Adams* time Immediately after the Fall; and then, in *Noahs* time, at and after the Flood; and the Knowledge and Observance of this Only Way of Salvation should have been Transmitted through all Ages and Nations by *Noahs* Posterity. And it is the Fault of Mankind, that this most Valuable and Necessary Piece of Knowledge hath been Slighted, and so far Lost to the World, as to leave but a few Dark Remains of it, in all these Places of the World, where GOD has not thought Fit, of His Infinite Mercy to Publish it *Afresh*.

Now, Mr. *Webster* Alledges, that My Saying, the Gospel, was Twice Published to All the World, first to Adam, then to Noah, is the very Assertion of *Arminians*. To which I Reply; Granting it be so, it is not the less true, seeing it is Ma-

nifest from the History of Moses, that at the
Two Times the Gospel was Published to All the
 Men then Living on the Earth: Unless Mr
Webster be of Opinion, that there were *Præadam-
 its* or *Præter-Adamits* in *Adams* time; or that
Noahs Flood did not over-spread the *Whole Earth*.
 I am sorry, to find, that Mr. *Websters* Flaming
 Zeal against the *Arminians* should so Dazle His
 Eyes, as to hinder Him from Discerning between
 Truth and Error Asserted by them.

P R O P. VII. If an Infant of Infidel Pa-
 rents come Lawfully into the Power of a Christian
 an, who is Able and Willing, or by a Lawful Tie
 is Obligated to do the Duty of a Parent, as to its
 Maintenance and Education, and can Bring it up
 in Christianity, and Offers to Engage so to do, in
 this Case, I think, *the Infant May be Baptized*.
 Seeing, altho' he be not his Son by Procreation,
 yet with respect to all that Concerns the Infants
 Maintenance, and Christian Education, he is a
 Son by Adoption, and as soon as he is thus put under
 the Care of a Christian, he becomes a Member of
 the Visible Church; this Providence of God being
 a Probable Sign, that he is One of Gods Elect
 as much as if he were the Natural Son of that
 Christian: Which Opinion does not, as Mr. *Web-
 ster* alledges, Contradict our Confession Chap. 28.
 § 1. I suppose, it shou'd be § 4. The Words are
*The Infants of one or both Believing Parents are
 to be Baptized.* Much less Chap. 25. § 2. For
 supposing Parents and Children Natural, in Op-
 position to Adoptive, be meant in both these Places
 of our Confession, yet, My Opinion does not Con-
 tradict

radiat what is there said, or in the Parallel places
 of the *Larger Cat.* Cited by Mr. *Webster*, seeing,
 My Opinion is about a Question, which neither
Confession nor *Catechism* do at all Determine. They
 do indeed Determine, that *the Infants of One or*
Both Believing Parents Are to be Baptized, or
Ought to be Baptized. But, what I say, is, That
Infants Procreated of Infidels, and Adopted by
Christian, May be Baptized; Which is no Sin-
 gular Opinion of Mine. For, *Walæus* is of the
 same Mind, yea, says more. See his *Loc. Com.*
de Bapt. pag. 491. where he follows the Senti-
 ments of *Augustin, de Gratia et Libero Arbit. Cap.*
22. and others of the *Ancients*, who Taught, that
Such Children of Infidels, as come Lawfully into
the Power of Christians were to be Baptized. And,
 he thinks, these come Lawfully into the Power of
 Christians, *who are taken in Lawful War, bought*
with Money, or Adopted: And, that those are to
 be Baptized, he Proves from *Gen. 17. 12,* and
Acts 2. 39. Of which Opinion is also the Lear-
 ned *Marckius* (whose Book I Teach) *Cap. 30.*
De Bapt. § 19. who there Reckons among the In-
 fants to be Baptized (whom he calls *Fæderatorum*
Infantes) *Adoptatos a Christianis, Expositos inter*
Christianos, &c. Now, it is plain, that those Bought
 with Money by the *Israelites*, were to be Circum-
 cised, according to *Gen. 17. 12.* Therefore, a
 fortiori, Infants of Infidel Parents, Adopted by
 Christians, or Bought with their Money (in both
 which Cases they are Obliged to Act the Part of
 Christian Parents to them) May be Baptized, un-
 less we suppose the Grace of the Covenant more
 Narrowed among Christians, than it was among
 the *Israelites*.

Therefore, I Conclude, This *Proposition* is not Relevant, nor any Other of the Preceeding Six, which Contain my Sentiments on this *Article*. And Crave, that Mr. *Webster* may be Obligated to Prove the Erroneous *Propositions* I have Refuted, or be Censured as a Slanderer.

Answer to *Libel*, Class. I. *Article* IV. and Class. II. *Article* IX. and Addit. *Libel*, Art. III.

MR. *Webster* upon this *Article*, has not the Assurance, positively to Affirm, that I hold any of the Errors, with respect to Gods Providence, Maintained by *Durandus*, *Jesuits*, and *Arminians*; yet, he Insinuates it, and says, *it seems I do*: I shall therefore set down these Erroneous Opinions, which he thus Indirectly Charges Me with, in a Way that does not Manifest too Much Christian Candor.

P R O P. I. *That the Providence of God with respect to Sinful Actions is only a Bare Permission, as the Jesuits and Arminians Hold.* (a)

This Proposition I Yearly Refute, and Teach the same Governing of Sinful Actions, which is Taught in our *Confession*, Chap. 5. § 4.

P R O P. II. *That God has not a Full and Absolute Dominion over Mens Free Actions, and Infallible Prescience of them.* (b)

These Pelagian Errors I Yearly Refute, and Teach the Contrary Truths, according to our *Confession* and *Catechisms*.

P R O P.

(a) See page 24. (b) page 25.

P R O P. III. *That I Embrace the Gross Error of Durandus and à Dola, who deny All Concourse of God with Mens Actions; and Own Only a giving Men Faculties and Powers of Acting and Conserving these Powers. (c)*

This Error I am so far from Embracing, that I do Refute it Yearly, in Teaching that very Paragraph to which the Libel Refers, which is Marck. Medull. Chap. 10. § 10. Where I Refute all the Four Pelagian Schemes, viz. *Mera Virium Conservatio. Simplex communis Legis Datio. Generalis Motus a Creaturis determinandus. Actus DEI simultaneus, in Actionem, non in Agentes, influens.*

PROP. IV. *That I Teach what is near a Kin to the Jesuits and Arminians Scientia media. (d)*
I Yearly Refute That *Scientia Media*; What I Teach about the Providence of GOD, is as little a Kin to it as what our Confession Teaches.

PROP. V. *Concursus then is Nothing else, but the Lords putting the Creature in such Circumstances, &c. This Description of Concursus, Contained in the Libel (e) is not Mine.*

As for what I Teach on this Subject, I cannot give a Distincter and Shorter View of it, than what is Contained in the Several Paragraphs of the 5 Chap. of our Confession of Faith; Every Proposition and Clause whereof I Teach, and Esteem to be the Best Account of the Doctrine of

(c) P. 26. (d) Ibid. (e) See P. 5-

of Providence, I have read. And so, I Desire, the *Presbytery*, and every Body else, may take the several Paragraphs of that Chapter as the Genuine Account of My Opinion. In a Word, I think, that, as GOD has Eternally and Unchangeably Decreed All Things that Come to pass, so, by His Holy, Wise, and Powerfull Providence, He does not only Preserve and Uphold, but also, Direct, Dispose and Govern all Creatures, Actions, and Things, from the Greatest to the Least; So as All Things come to pass Immutably and Infallibly, according to His Foreknowledg and Decree: Yet, by the same Providence He Ordereth them to fall out according to the Nature of Second Causes; Which Providence Extendeth it self even to the First Fall, and all other Sins of Angels and Men, and that not by a Bare Permission, but such as hath joyned with it a Most Wise and Powerful Bounding, and otherwise Ordering and Governing of them in a manifold Dispensation, to His Own Holy Ends.

According to this Doctrine of our *Confession* and *Catechisms*, I Distinguish the Providence of GOD into these Two Branches; Namely, *That* Providence whereby he Preserves, and Upholds All the Creatures made by Him, for such Time Uses, and Ends, and in such a Way and Manner, as from Eternity He Designed. 2^{ly}, *That* whereby He Governs All His Creatures, and all their Actions.

Now, it being this Branch of Providence, about which Mr. W. Challenges Me, I shall Endeavour to Give My Opinion of it in few Words.

First,

First, 'Governing Providence is that Holy and Wise Exercise of the Power of GOD the First Cause, whereby He Ordereth All the Motions and Actions of His Creatures whatsoever, with all their Effects, to come to pass Immutably and Infallibly, according to his own Eternal Decree and Foreknowledg, and also Agreeably to the Nature of Second Causes, Necessarily, Freely, or Contingently. And this Description I Think Sufficient, both for *Gubernatio* and *Concurfus*; All that is Necessary to be Believed about *Concurfus* being Included herein; Which is plainly the Mind of the Authors of our *Confession* and *Catechisms*.

2dly, As to the Particular Way, that GOD Exercises this His Governing Power in many Cases, I neither do, nor can pretend to Determine. That there is a Certain and Infallible Connexion betwixt the Eternal Decree of GOD and All Events in Time, and that the Falling out of All Events, from the Greatest to the Least, according to the said Decree of GOD, is steadily Brought to pass, by the All-wise and Powerful Providence of GOD, I am Certain of, from Scripture and Reason; But, as to the Way and Manner, how it is done, I know not, and think it My Duty to say with the Apostle, *Rom. II. 33. O the Depth of the Riches both of the Wisdom and Knowledg of GOD! How Unsearchable are His Judgements, and His Ways are past finding out!*

3dly, As to the way of Explaining this Connexion, by an Immediate Physical Previous Impulse and Motion of the Creature in all its Actions,

ons, Even these that are most Sinful and Necessary
ly Evil, which Prof. *Marck*, and many Others follow.
I freely Own that I am not Satisfied with it, and
Know, that 'tis only an *Hypothesis* framed for Ex-
plaining this Connexion, which, when applyed to
Sinful Actions, does much Increase the Difficulties
in stead of Diminishing them, which I could
prove, were this a fit Place for it: And I see
nothing from Scripture or Reason, to perswade
Me, that such an Immediate, Physical Determina-
tion, is the only Method, by which the All-Wise
and Powerful GOD, can secure the foresaid In-
fallible Connexion between His Eternal Decree
and Events in Time.

4ly. Altho' I do not determine the Way
which GOD does it, yet I think, He may De-
termine infallibly all the Actions of Reasonable
Creatures, that are not above their Natural Pow-
ers, and are not contrary to their present Inclination
and Dispositions, by placing them in such Cir-
cumstances, by which they have a certain Series
or Train of Motives laid before them, by which
they may Infallibly, yet freely produce such a
Series of Actions, as He has Decreed. And this
Way, I think, may be sufficient, for Ascertain-
ing all the Events of Sinful Actions, and of the Or-
dinary Natural and Civil Actions of Men. But
in the Case of all Gracious Actions, and such as
are above our Natural Powers, and Contrary
to our Inclinations and present Dispositions, it is
Evident, this Way cannot be Sufficient. And
considering the Indwelling Body of Death, that
Believers have while on Earth, besides the
Temptations of Satan, and an Evil World, the

continually assault them while here; I think it Evident, that not only Divine Illumination, but also Continual Influences of the Almighty Power of the Grace of GOD, are Necessary to a Believers Walking in the Ways of Truth and Holiness while here on Earth; Which Immediate Power of GOD doth not Diminish, but Increase their Natural Liberty, and is very agreeable to the Holy Nature of GOD. But, if such an Immediate Power of GOD were applyed to Men in all their Sinful Actions, whereby they are Disposed and Excited to pass Rash Judgements, and Choose what is Evil, I humbly think, it may be Questioned, if it would not Diminish their Liberty, and be hard to Reconcile with the Holiness of GOD; And therefore Think, that from Predetermination in Gracious Actions, no Consequence can be Drawn for its having Place in Sinful Actions, or from its being Needless in Sinful Actions, that it is not Necessary to Gracious Actions.

But Mr. Webster alledges, *My denying the Necessity of Physical Predetermination, or Immediate Previous Concourse to all Humane Actions, even the most Sinful, is contrary to our Conf. chap. 5. §. 4. Which extends GODs Active Providence to the Sins of Men.* The Words of our Confession are, *The Almighty Power, Unsearchable Wisdom, and Infinite Goodness of GOD so far manifest Themselves in his Providence, that it extendeth it self even to the first Fall, and all other Sins of Angels and Men; and that not by a bare Permission, but such as hath joined with it a most Wise and Powerful Bounding and otherwise Ordering and Governing*

verning them in a manifold Dispensation to His Own Holy Ends.

Now, I wish, Mr. Webster had told which of these Expressions signifie Immediate, Previous, Physical Concourse, or Impulse: As for my Part, according to the small Knowledge I have of the English Tongue, I can find None of them Capable of that Sense: And, had the Authors of Our Confession Designed to Teach such a Doctrine, I Cannot Imagine, what should have Moved them to Express it in their *Confession*, in Words that are never elsewhere Used to Signifie any such Thing.

But, Mr. Webster Insinuates, that they must mean it, *because that they Teach, GODs Active Providence Extends it self to the Sins of Men.*

I Reply, this might have some Colour of Truth were it Evident, that the Providence of GOD can Extend it self to the Sins of Men no other Way, than by such a Previous Impulse. But if He say, that this is Evident, He will Contradict our *Confession*, which Mentions several other Ways whereby the Active Providence of GOD Extends it self to the Sinful Actions of Angels and Men such as, *A most Wise and Powerful Bounding, and otherwise Ordering, and Governing of them,* and this it does, without giving the least Hint of the Way that Mr. Webster Pleads for.

But says Mr. W. *The Scriptures Adduced for Proof of this Providence make it Manifest, that by the Providence Extending to Mens Sins they Understand this Previous Physical Concourse in Sinful Actions.* (f)

To which I Reply, 1st. If it be Proved by the Scriptures they adduce, it is Strange, that they did not plainly Assert it.

2^{ly}. I think it Evident, that the Scriptures here Mentioned by Mr. *Webster*, neither prove such a Previous Physical Concourse, nor that the Authors of our *Confession* meant any such Thing, when they say, *the Providence of GOD extends it self to the Sins of Men*, there being nothing in any of them that Insinuates it.

This therefore, I think, needs no further Answer, until Mr. *Webster* have tryed His Logick and Divinity in Proving what He here Alledges : Only I desire, that 2 Sam. 24. 1. may be Compared with 1 Chron. 21. 1. and that both these may be Compared with the following 5. 1. of our *Confession*, and the Scriptures there Cited, whereof 2 Sam. 24. 1. is one : By which means, I hope, Mr. *Webster* may see, and others will perceive, that the Meaning of the Authors of our *Confession* is, *that the Most Wise, Righteous, and Gracious GOD, doth oft times leave for a Season His Own Children to manifold Temptations and the Corruption of their own Hearts &c.* without Insinuating one Word of such a Physical Previous Impulse. In Relation also to GODs Leaving His Children to such Temptations, we are to Understand the Deprecations of David Psal. 119. &c. and Compare them with that Petition of the *Lords Prayer*, **AND LEAD US NOT INTO TEMPTATION.** Whether GOD may in a Holy Way Incline us Physically by an Immediat Previous Impulse to the Physical Entity and Substrate Act of Covetousness, or the like Sinful Actions (as Mr. *Webster* thinks) is more

more than I can tell; But I think it Manifest, that *Davids Deprecations Psal. 119.* and the like, Prove no such Thing; Seeing they do not Necessarily Relate to any thing else; but GODs Leaving His Children to such Temptations, as are Mentioned in the foresaid 5. §. of our *Confession*.

But says Mr. *Webster* further, *The Authors of our Confession oppose this Providence to the Bare Permission of Arminians and Jesuits, and say, the Providence is a Governing of sinful Actions, and quote Isa 10. 6, 7, 12.*

To which I answer, that I do also the same, and do Yearly Refute, oftner than once, the Bare Permission of the *Jesuits and Arminians*, and Teach, that Divine Providence doth so Powerfully and Effectually Govern all Sinful Actions, as that all of them steadily fall out according to GODs Eternal Decree, and for Promoting his Holy Ends. And, do also Cite to this Purpose *Isa. 10. 6.* and many other Texts of Scripture. Yet, with our *Confession*, I leave out the Previous *Physical Impulse*.

Mr. *Webster* Adds, *That indeed the Scriptures furnish us with a great many Arguments for the Concurse in Sinful Actions; Sometimes GOD is said, to Blind, Harden, to Give up to Strong Delusions; To which he may add, GODs putting a lying Spirit in the Mouth of Ahabs Prophets, 1 Kings 22. 23.* To which I answer, in the Words of the said 5 Chap. of our *Conf.* § 6. "As for those Wicked and Ungodly Men, whom God as a Righteous Judge, for former Sins, doth Blind and Harden, from them he not only withholdeth his Grace, whereby they might have been

"En

Enlightened in their Understandings, and Wrought upon in their Hearts; But some times also Withdraweth the Gifts which they had, and exposeth them to such Objects, as their Corruption makes Occasions of Sin, and withal gives them over to their own Lusts, the Temptations of the World, and the Power of Satan: Whereby it comes to pass, that they harden themselves, even under those Means which GOD useth for the softning of others: I desire Mr. Webster may Read the Scriptures there Cited, where we have a very Rational Account of the Meaning of such Scriptures, and why these Sinful Actions are Ascribed to GOD, without the least Imputation of Mr. Websters Previous Physical Impulse. I desire also, he may Read the Famous Mr. Twisses Explication of GODs Hardening Pharaohs Heart, in his *Vind. Grat.* in Fol. Lib 2. cap. 1. page 93. Mr. Webster says further, Yea, the Universal, Physical, Previous Concurse, seems to have been known to some Heathens by the very Light of Nature; for One of them is quoted by the Apostle as saying, In God we Live, Move, and have our Being.

To which I Reply, 1st. That these Words do not properly Signifie, or Intimate any such Thing; Lying being, they only signifie, that we have from God our Being, and all Principles of Life and Motion, and that He Preserves Us, and Powerfully governs Us and all our Actions, according to His own Purposes, and for His Own Ends, and is always Intimatly Present with Us, in all that We hold. Which Sense agrees very well with the Words, and the Apostles Argument, and is the Cur-

rent Exposition of our Best Divines, that I have Read upon this Text; None of whom Expound them of the *Previous Physical Concourse*.

2dly, I have as yet seen no Good Proof for the Apostles Citing these Words out of a Heathen Author, as Mr. Webster positively Determines; Altho' I know, some Learned Men think that He either Cites or Alludes unto an Old *Famili-
bic* Verse to that purpose, but Name not the Poet: But, we have Sufficient Evidence of his Citing the Heathen Poet *Aratus* for the following Words *Τὸ γὰρ καὶ τὸ ἐν ἑσπερίῳ*, seeing Jerom Owns, that in his Time, they were Extant in the *Phænomena* of *Aratus*, in which Poem of his there are now Extant, a little from the beginning, exactly as Cited by our Apostle; and the Sense would be Incomplete without them.

Mr. Webster adds further, *This all our Divines Maintain, in their Systems and Polemicks, against Arminians and Jesuits.*

To which I Answer, 1st, Granting it were so, I Can Oppose to Them Our *Confession* and *Catechisms*, which Reject all the Dangerous Errors advanced against the Special and Particular Providence of God, whether vented By *Arminians*, *Jesuits* or Others, and Assert the Contrary Doctrine Necessary to be Believed and Taught, without the least Mention, as I have said, of this *Previous Physical Impulse*, altho' it was Taught in the Schools by Some, and Opposed by Others long before our *Confession* was Framed, and

(h) In Epist. ad Galat. Cap. 4. P. 280. Edit. P. 1706. Et in Epist. ad Tit. Cap. 1. P. 420. ejusd. Edit.

both by *Papists* and *Protestants*. Neither is this Question Determined in any other of the *Confessions* of the Reformed Churches. Whence it is Evident, that the Authors of Our Own, and the Other Reformed *Confessions*, have Judged the Doctrine about *Physical Predetermination* not Necessary to be Believed as an Article of Faith; Wherefore, altho' all our *Systematick Divines* did Teach it, I am not Concerned to follow them.

2ly It is not True, that it is Taught by all our Divines; For, *Calvin*, *Peter Martyr*, and others of Our Reformers, Satisfie *Themselves* with Teaching the Doctrine of GODs Universal and particular Providence, so far as they had it in their *Confessions*, and according to what we have it in Ours; And do Propose Fairly, and Answer Clearly and Convincingly all the Objections; we find, have been hitherto Raised against this doctrine, yet without making any Mention of this immediat, *Previous, Physical Impulse*. See *Calv. Institut. Lib. I. Cap. 16.* and *Pet. Mart. Loc. Comm. I. Cap. 13. 14.* And I know no Reason obliging Me to Follow Latter Orthodox Divines more than Elder, even tho' they should be More Number. What Determines Me in Following that Either of them Teach, is the Force I find in their Arguments.

I shall not Trouble the Presbytery with the Arguments He makes Use of from the Authority of the Sounder *Papists*, *Dominicans* and *Consenists*; the former of whom, if Sounder in the Speculations, are the Groffest Idolaters and the Cruel Persecuters in the Church of *Rome*: or shall I here Notice the Mighty Influence

upon the Practice of Piety, that he Pretends, does flow from this Doctrine of *Physical Concurse*, it being known by Experience, that the Extending it to Evil Actions hath the quite Contrary Effect: I also pass by His Reflections upon the *Lame* and scarce Intelligible Account of My Opinion Contained in His *Libel*, they being Nothing at all to the Purpose in Hand.

I therefore only take Notice of these Two Things; 1st. That He says, *Without the fore-said Concurse, the Dominion of GOD over Mens Free Actions, must be Denied, and likewise His Prescience of Free Actions, unless we say, that the Eternal Decree concerning Them, comes in the Room of the Transient Physical Operation.* To which I Answer, 1st. What would be the Error, if it were said, that the same Unchangeable Act of GODs Will, by which He Decrees all Things from Eternity, brings all Things to pass in Time? 2ly. Tho' this *Previous Concurse* be Denied, yet there is no Need of Denying GODs Dominion over Mens Free Actions, or His Prescience of them; unless it can be first Demonstrated, that This is the Only Way of Securing His Dominion and Prescience; And, suppose it were Demonstrated, his Consequence will not be Good unless it be also Proved, that no Person can Believe the Dominion and Prescience of GOD, unless he Know and Believe the Particular Way that GOD Exercises his Dominion, and the Method of His Foreknowledg; The former, I think, he will not easily Prove, and the latter, I know he cannot, being Contrary to Experience, as well as Reason: For, if GOD have clearly Re-

vealed

vealed, that He has an Absolute Dominion over all the Free Actions of Men, by which they are Regulated according to His Pleasure and Foreknowledge, any Man may, and should Believe the Truth of this, altho' he Know Nothing at all of the Way and Manner of it. 3dly, This Argument of His casts a Reflection upon Our Own, and all the Other Reformed *Confessions*, for Omitting a Necessary Article of Faith, viz. *The Asserting the Immediate Previous Physical Concourse*, upon which Two Other Articles of great Importance, viz. *GODs Absolute Dominion over the Free Actions of Men, and His Foreknowledge of them*, do Depend, according to Him. Lastly, Had he Understood, as he should, the True Hinge of the Controversy on this Head of Divinity, that we have with the *Pelagians*, *Jesuits*, and *Arminians*, I Conceive, he would have Spared this Article of his Libel, To Convince him whereof, I shall set down a Passage or Two, from the Famous Mr. *Rutherford* (whom he justly Commends) who in his *Book de Provid. Cap. 4. Pag. 44.* Answers a Passage out of *Lodovicus a Dola* Thus, *Si Adversarii Concederent nobis Determinationem qua DEUS Indeclinabiliter Voluntatem quocunque ipse vult inflecteret, Dominium aliud non peteremus; sed sic Libertas Jesuitico-Arminiana, quæ semper in æquilibrio ad velle & nolle stat, corrueret.* And in his *Exercit. Apologet. Exerc. 3. Cap. 1. P. 402.* says, *Quæstio itaque præcipue est de Indeclinabilitate Actus liberi quam si quidem illi nobis tribuerent Physicæ Prædeterminationi valedicere parati sumus.*

The Other Thing I Notice, is, That My Opinion about Concuse (as he Alledges) is *Too near a Kin to the Jesuits and Arminians Scientia Media*; Which I cannot Perceive in it, even as My Opinion is Indistinctly Represented in his Libel; Which gives Me Ground to Suspect, that Mr. *Webster* does not very well Understand wherein the Error of their *Scientia Media* does ly; And that he may get a Right Notion of it, I would have him Read Our *Confess.* Chap. 3. §. 2. *Altho' GOD Knows whatsoever may, or can come to pass upon all Supposed Conditions, yet bath He not Decreed any Thing, because He foresaw it as Future, or as that which would come to pass upon such Conditions.*

As for the *Confession of His Faith* on this Point, I Wish Him much Good of it, and Declare, that Mine is in the 5. Chap. of Our *Confession*. I Wish, that some, now a Days, may not think it a Jest to say, That GODs Providence, is Effective of the *Entity*, and only Permissive of the *Malitia*; Seeing, if it be Effective of the *Entity*, it cannot Hinder the *Malitia*, except by Disannulling, or Dispensing with the Law, which with Respect to many Sinful Actions, GOD can no more Do, than He can Ly, or Deny Himself.

Upon the whole, I Plead, that there is Nothing Taught by Me, Relating to this Article, which is Contrary either to Scripture, or our *Confession* and *Catechisms*; and Crave, that Mr. *Webster* may either Prove the forementioned *Arminian* and *Jesuitical* Errors, which He Indirectly Charges Me with, or be Censured for Slander. I shall here

take Notice of His Inconsistent Way of Libelling; For, in the First Article of his Libel he Charges Me with Error, for Teaching what there is No *Innuendo* of in Our *Confession*; and in This Article he Charges me with Error, for not Teaching, what, I suppose, every Body except Himself, sees, there is not the least *Innuendo* of in our *Confession*.

Answers to Libel, Class I. Article V. and
Class II. Article XII.

IN this Article Mr Webster Accuses me for saying, 'The Desire of Reward and the Fear of Punishment may not only be a Motive (as our Author *Marckius* sayeth) but should be the Chief Motive to the Rational Creature in Worshipping the LORD: for GOD has so Formed the Rational Creature, as Chiefly to Seek its Own Good and Happiness. To which I Answer,

1st, That this is not a Distinct and True Account of My Opinion.

2ly, I Give this Short Account of My Opinion, in the Following Propositions.

PROP. I. GOD Could have no Other or Higher End in Making the World, with Man and other Rational Creatures in it, than the Shewing forth the Glory of His Excellent Perfections, In, By, and upon Them; to which End they Must be All Subservient, whether in a State of Happiness or Misery.

PROP. II. No Rational Creature can Love

any Person, or Thing but under the Notion of Real or Apparent Good, or what is Pleasing to *it Self*; Nor can it Hate or Shun any Thing, but under the Notion of Real or Apparent Evil or Uneasiness to *it Self*. Good Real or Apparent with Respect to *it Self*, being the Adequat Object of Love in a Rational Being; and Real or Apparent Evil Relative to *it Self*, being the Adequat Object of the Rational Creatures Hatred or Aversion.

PROP. III. What is Conceived by a Rational Creature to be its Chief Good, it Chiefly Loves and Seeks to Obtain; And so must Propose as its Chief End, or Greatest Happiness: And when it makes a Right Judgement and Choise of its Greatest Good and Chief End, it Chooses that which GOD its Creator has proposed as its Greatest Good and Chief End; whereby its Real and Apparent Good are the same.

PROP. IV. GOD in His Infinite Wisdom has not only Declared Himself to be the Author and Bestower of all Good from the Greatest to the Least; but also has Proposed to Mankind, Himself to be Eternally Enjoyed and Glorified by them as their Greatest Good and Chief End.

PROP. V. As Necessary Means to Obtain this Greatest Good or Happiness, GOD has in His Infinite Wisdom and Goodness required that we Glorify Him by whatever we do here on Earth, not only by Proposing His Honour as the Chief End of all we do, and Preferring it to all our Worldly Comforts, and Life *it Self*; but also by Promoting it through the whole Course of our Life, by the

Care

Careful Observance of the Rule of Righteousness, which in his Word he has Declared, to be the only Way to Please and Glorifie Him.

Whence it is Manifest, that our Greatest Good, or Chief End, and also our Subordinat Good, or the Necessary Means leading thereunto, are Necessarily Subordinat unto the Glory of GOD; and Both of them Natively Tend to Promote it, both in Time and Eternity.

PROP. VI. Every Man is Obliged to Propose as His Chief Good and End, the Eternal Enjoying and Glorifying of GOD fully; and ought to Seek to Obtain it, by his Active Glorifying Him here on Earth according to the Prescription of His Word: Which Two if he Observe, he cannot Miss of Glorifying GOD, and of being made Fully and Eternally Happy therein. Neither will any Man come Short of Eternal Happiness, but He who seeks His Chief Good in Something Else, than the Eternal Enjoying and Glorifying GOD; or seeks to Obtain it in an Other Way than GOD has Prescribed; To Which if he will not Subject Himself, he thereby Manifestly Declares, that he has not Really Chosen GOD as his Greatest Good, seeing he will not Observe that Rule, which GOD Declares to be the Way to Please Him, and Promote His Honour: Therefore it is Just with GOD not only to Deprive him of All Happiness, but to make him Eternally and Utterly Miserable.

Whence it Manifestly Appears, how Wisely GOD has Chosen the Means that He has Appointed for Mans Salvation, both with Respect to their Fitness

Fitness for Mans Obtaining his Chief End, and Respect to their Promoting GODs Glory, which is His Chief End. And it is also Manifest, that our Chief Happiness, or Misery, are the Chief Motives to our Glorifying GOD on Earth.

PROP. VII. Altho' GOD Can Promote His Own Glory (which is His Chief End) by the Eternal Misery of some Reasonable Creatures, such as Men; yet He Cannot Propose to them, nor Require of them, that they should Love, Desire and Seek, as their Chief End, any Thing Else, but that wherein their Own Chief Happiness Consists. If He did Otherwise, He should Impose upon Them a Law, Contrary both to His Own Nature and Theirs. From which it Follows, That what GOD may Wisely and Righteously Propose as His Chief End, in Making some Rational Creatures, Cannot at all be Their Chief End.

Mr. Webster says, *That My Opinion, as Contained in his Libel is Contrary to the Answer of the First Question of our Catechism.* Whether he will say so or not, of this Account, I have given of it, I Know not; Only I suspect, he may, by the Reason he gives, which is this; *As the Answer makes a Complex End of our Actions, Gods Glory, and Our Happiness, so it gives the Preference to Gods Glory.* The Scriptures quoted are Rom. II. 36. I Cor. IO. 31. and 6. 20. (a)

From which it Appears to Me, that Mr. Webster Mistakes the Meaning of the Answer, the plain Sense whereof is, 1st, That by Enjoying of GOD for ever, is Meant, Our Enjoying Him Fully

and Eternally in Heaven, as appears from the Answer, to this Question in the *Larger Catechism*. 2ly, By *Glorifying God* is not only meant, that we should Propose Gods Glory as the End of all our Actions; but also, that we should Really and Actively Glorifie Him, in the Course of our Life here on Earth, by Faith and Obedience, according to the Scripture Rule; as is plain from the 2d and 3d Questions of the *Lesser Catechism*, with their Answers, where we see, *The Scriptures are the Rule of our Glorifying and Enjoying God; And, the Scriptures Principally Teach, what we are to Believe Concerning God, and what Duty God Requires of Man*: In which Two are Summed up the Means of Glorifying God here, and of Enjoying Him hereafter; The Explication of which Faith and Obedience takes up all the rest of the *Catechism*. 3dly, Our Active Glorifying of God here, by Faith and Holiness, according to the Scripture, is the Necessary Means of Obtaining the Full Enjoyment of God for ever; as is plain from the whole Tenor of Gods Word, which expressly calls *The Salvation of our Souls the End of our Faith*, 1 Pet. 1. 9. and calls *Everlasting Life the End of becoming Servants to God, and of having Fruit unto Holiness*, Rom. 6. 22. which is also Evident from the Nature of the Things themselves. So, our Active Glorifying of God here is the Means, and our full Enjoying of Him is the End. 4ly, These Two taken together and with this Relation to one another, make up but One Means for Glorifying the Goodness, Mercy and Holiness, &c. of God: For, according to the Method of Grace delivered in Scripture, supposing, we should Glorifie

Glorifie God here as he Requires, He could not be Glorified thereby, unless we also Enjoyed Him for ever : And, on the other hand, God cannot be Glorified by our Enjoying Him for ever, unless we should first Glorifie Him here, by the Exercise of Faith and Holiness, in case we be Adult and Capable of Outward Means ; or have what is Equivalent thereto, if Infants. These Two therefore, being so Inseparably Linked together by the Constitution of God, are very Reasonably Joyned together as Mans Chief End, in the Answer to the Question, which makes the End Complex : Yet so as the former Branch, *Our Glorifying God*, being the Means, is *Subordinat* to our *full Enjoyment of Him for ever, which is our Ultimat End*; And the plain Reason, why our Glorifying God is first set down in the Answer of our *Catechism* designed for the Vulgar, is, Because it is the Necessary Means and Subordinat End of Our Enjoying Him for ever, and lies upon us as the great Duty of our Life, as we desire to be Happy, in the Enjoyment of God for ever, which being the Ultimate End, must needs be the Chief Motive to Engage us to Glorifie God, or, which is the same, to Use the Necessary Means of Enjoying God, as our Chief Happiness for ever.

Now, According to this account of the Answer 'tis Obvious, 1st, That our Active Glorifying of God is the End of our Life and Actions here on Earth ; which therefore we must Prefer to all Worldly Pleasures and Comforts, and even to our Life it self, all which we must rather part with than Dishonour God, or Neglect Honouring Him in the way he has prescribed in his Word.

2dly, Th

2dly, The End of our Active Glorifying of God, is our full Enjoying and Glorifying Him for ever in Heaven, which is Our last End; that on no Account, we can be Obliged to part with.

3dly, The Ultimate End of both these is the Glory of GODs Infinite Wisdom, Mercy, Holiness, and other Attributes Glorified by Mans Salvation.

This being Unquestionably the true Meaning of the Answer to the Question of our Catechism, to which the foresaid Propositions Containing my Opinion do evidently agree; I shall not spend Time in Noticing what may be wrong in Mr. Websters Gloss upon it; Seeing the *Presbytery*, and every Intelligent Reader may at first View perceive, whether his Sense or mine is the best, and what his Error is will appear afterwards.

I only Notice, that the Scriptures cited to prove this Answer, do Manifestly prove that Sense I have given of it. The first of them is 1 Cor. 10. 31. Which evidently Proves the first of these Three Propositions just now Mentioned, viz. that Our Active Glorifying GOD, is the End of our whole Life and Actions here on Earth, so that, *whether we Eat or Drink, or whatever we do, We must do all to the Glory of GOD.* The Second Scripture is Rom. 11. 36. *For of Him, and through Him, and to Him are all Things, to Whom be Glory for ever, Amen;* Where, I Grant, the Apostle Advanceth Good Solid Ethicks, to prove that none of GODs Creatures can Justly Complain of Him, tho' He make Use of them, for promoting His Glory in the Way He thinks Best, whether by their Happiness or Misery. He gives

gives us also an Example of a good Christian Practice, when from the Consideration of GOD being the First Cause and last End of all Things, He Ascribes Eternal Glory to Him: Which Apostolick Practice, being Recorded for our Imitation, Proves that we should Glorify GOD in the Course of our Life; Which is another Confirmation of the First Proposition. And when the Apostle Asserts, that GOD is the First Cause and Last End of all Things, he teaches, that we and all Things else were made for Him, and therefore must be Means Subserving to Promote His Glory, either Actively, in a State of Happiness, or Passively, in a State of Misery; And that we ought always to Remember and Acknowledge this to the Glory of GOD; the Truth of the First Proposition Expressing My Opinion, is thereby Proved. That GOD should be Eyed also by us, as our Chiefest End, and the Ultimate End of all Things, I have Owned; And do grant that it carries the highest Congruity to Sanctified Reason, yea to Common Sense, that we, owing all we Are, have, can Do, Look at, or Hope for, to His Exuberant Goodness, should Direct all our Thoughts, Words and Actions Chiefly to Him; And Submit all our Comforts on Earth to His Disposall, and be Ready to Part with them, and Life it Self for His Glory, according to 1 Cor. 6. 20. and 10. 31. And, if this be all that Mr. *Webster* means, there is no Difference betwixt us.

But, if his Meaning be, that We are to Prefer the Glory of GOD to Our Chief Happiness, and Satisfying Pleasure, in the Eternal Enjoying

and Glorifying Him in Heaven, and be Denied to this, and Willing for ever to Part with it, of GODs Glory should Require this, according to His Sovereign Pleasure; If this, I say, be his Meaning, as what he says afterward seems to Import, then I Own, I am not of His Mind; Being Persuaded, that this is Contrary both to Common Sense, and Sanctified Reason, and is a Piece of Unsolid and Absurd *Metaphysicks*, which was never Taught, by any of the Prophets or Apostles, nor by any Person well Skilled in *Philosophy* and *Divinity*. On the Contrary, when we Place our Chiefest Happiness, and Most Satisfying Delight, in Beholding and Admiring the Glory of GODs Most Excellent Perfections, and being made as like to Him in Holiness and Glory, as Our Finite Natures can Allow, and, in Enjoying the Ravishing Pleasure of Proclaiming his Praises to all Eternity, under the continual Influences of His Exuberant Goodness: When, I say, we Propose this as Our Greatest Happiness and Chief End, we do most Effectually Glorify GOD; And this we cannot be Obligated to be Denied to, or Part with; Nor is it Consistent with GODs Nature or Ours, to Propose to us, or Require of us, a Higher End than this: And Our having this truly as Our Chief End, with a Sutable Desire of Obtaining it, is the Chief Motive to Constrain us, to Glorifie GOD in the whole Course of our Life and Actions, over the Greatest Dangers and Difficulties that may ly in Our Way. This the Apostle John Teaches, 1 Joh. 3. 2, 3.-----When He shall appear, we shall be like Him, for we shall

shall See Him as He is; And Every Man that bath this Hope in Him, Purifieth Himself as He is Pure. The Apostle Paul also Tells us, that *GOD will Render Eternal Life, to them who by Patient Continuance in Well-doing Seek for Glory, Honour, and Immortality; Rom. 2. 7.* Our Eternal Happiness in the Enjoyment of GOD, is, through the whole Scripture, Proposed as the Chief Motive of Our Love and Obedience, nor can there be a Higher.

But Mr. Webster Alledges, that this is to Love Our Selves better than GOD; for Loving our own Happiness is Loving our Selves; and so it is Contrary to the Sum of the Ten Commandments.

To which I Answer 1st, The Sum of the Ten Commands is, To Love the Lord our GOD, with all our Heart, Soul, Strength, and Mind, and our Neighbour, as our Selves: Now, can any Man, in Reason, say, that these Words Require us to Love GOD above our Eternal Happiness in the Enjoyment of Him for Ever?

2^{ly}, The Command Requiring us to give Our Chief Love to GOD, plainly Intimates, that He must needs be our Chief Good and Greatest Happiness; and therefore, GOD, to Assure His People hereof, and Move them to this Love, Declares Himself to be their Chief Good, in the Preface to the Ten Commands, *I am the Lord thy GOD &c.* If this be to Love Our selves Better than GOD, as I think it is not, then it is Only what the Sum of the Ten Commands Obliges us unto: And I Challenge Mr. Webster and All that will take His Part, to Adduce One Text of Scripture, to Prove, that GOD Requires of His People a High-

that Degree of Love than This, that they Love GOD with all their Heart, Soul and Mind, as being the Author and Object of their Greatest Happiness; And it is a Vain Imagination, in Mr. Webster, and the Antinomians, and Mysticks (with whom in this He seems to Agree), to Fancy, that they can Love GOD, or any other Person, or Thing, but under the Notion of Good to them. For, let us take, for Example, a Servant, that Serves Cheerfully, more from Respect to his Masters Honour and Commands, than from Love to his Wages, or Fear of the Whip; it is Evident that this Servant Does so, Because his Masters Honour, and Obedience to his Commands, are a Greater Good to him, than his Wages; which he is more Afraid of Losing the Pleasure of, than of Losing his Wages, or Suffering the Whip; which are, in his Esteem, a Less Evil. The same holds of his Indiscreet Woman, who was for Burning Heaven, and quenching Hell, that People might Love GOD Only for Himself; For, suppose, that this Woman Loved GOD above all Things, then She must Conceive Him to be the Object of her Chief Happiness: Or, if She Love Him Only for Himself, Excluding all Things else, She must needs Conceive Him Alone to be her Complete Happiness, or adequate Object of her Love, and so it is still her Chief Happiness, or GOD Considered as her Only or Chief Happiness, that she Loves, whatever she may Foolishly Imagine to the Contrary; For, if She had no Pleasure or Happiness placed in God, it is Absolutely Impossible that She could Love Him at all.

I Grant to Mr. *Webster*, that our Glorifying God here on Earth, and our Enjoying Him for ever in Heaven (whereof the Answer in our *Catechism* speaks) are Two Different Things, tho' they do not Differ *Specie*, but *Gradu & Circumstantiis*, as the Schools Speak, such a Degree of Enjoying Him here, as, at least, makes us Delight to Promote His Honour, by doing His will (even while we want the Sense of His Love) being a necessary Ingredient of our Glorifying Him; And in Heaven, a special Ingredient of our Enjoying Him, will be the Pleasure we shall have in shewing forth the Praise of His Glory.

I Grant also, that a Person may be Obligated to Glorifie God, by Undergoing the Greatest Temporary Afflictions, and that our Lord Suffered the Pains of *Hell* in a most Intense Degree, where by He Preferred Gods Glory to these Temporary Sufferings; But, He was not Required to Prefer Gods Glory to His Eternal Happiness, in the Enjoyment of Him: Nor was it Consistent with the Nature of God, to Require it of Him, to Undergo these Sufferings to Eternity; Nor was it Consistent with the Holy Human Nature of Christ to have Complied therewith: Whence it is Evident, that He neither Did, nor Could Prefer Gods Glory to His Own Greatest Happiness, He Reigning Gloriously at Gods Right Hand for Ever, which Moved Him to Undertake and Undergo his Sufferings, with the Greatest of Heroic Courage and Resolution; for, as the Apostle tells us, *Heb. 12. 2. For the Joy set before Him He Endured the Cross, Despising the Shame.*

Mr. Webster is also very far Mistaken; if He think, that Moses and Paul, in their Self denying Wishes, had a Greater Regard to the glory of GOD, than to their Own Eternal Happiness, and that they were Willing to Part with their eternal Enjoyment of God, if it might Promote His Glory: And he will not be Able to Adduce the Current Exposition of Orthodox Divines in favour of this Meaning, altho' he may find Anomians and Mysticks, with Mr Hooker and Mr. Shepherd, for it, who are Excellently Refuted by Charles Firmin, in his *Real Christian*. And truly, to put this Sense upon the Wishes of these Eminent Saints, is to make them Guilty of a Gross Act of Impiety, Contrary to their Nature, both Men and Saints; which Fault Cannot be justly Charged upon them, according to the Rules of Charity and Right Interpretation, seeing their Words easily admit of a Safe Sense, and truly report no more, than their Wishing to be Deprived of all the Honours and Comforts they enjoy in the World, and of Life it self, rather than God should be Dishonoured and their Countrymen Destroyed.

Mr. Webster Subjoyns Two Questions, which I must Answer, least He think them Unanswerable. The first is, *To which of the Saints will the Professor turn, as of the same Selfish Sentiments with Himself?* Answer, I will Turn first to Our Lord Jesus Christ, the King of Saints, Who, for the Joy Before Him Endured the Cross, despising the shame. Next, I will Turn to Abraham the Father of the Faithful, who Obeyed Gods Call. For he looked for a City which hath Foundations

tions whose Builder and Maker is God, Heb. 11. 8.-----10, 14-----16. Next, I will Turn to Moses who Chused Affliction with the People of God before the pleasures of Sin, &c. (The only Reason given for his so doing is) For he had Respect unto the Recompense of the Reward; And, no wonder he did it for this End, seeing, He did it by Faith. Yea, I may Turn to the Whole Cloud of Witnesses, mentioned in that Chap. who Did and Suffered such Great Things, through Faith in Gods Promises, and the Hope they had of Obtaining Better Resurrection, as is Noticed, v. 35. Little to mention no more, I shall Turn to the Apostle Paul, who sets his Own Practice before us as an Example, Phil. 3. 14. I press toward the Mark for the Prize of the High Calling of God in Christ Jesus. None of all These Preferred Gods Glory to their Eternal Salvation; but they looked upon the Crown of Righteousness and Glory, in the full Enjoyment of God for ever, as a Prize worth Contending for; and made Use of it, as the Chief Motive to Engage them to Glorify God on Earth through Difficulties, Torments and Death. And if the Lord shall Enable Me by His Grace, to Follow the Cloud of Witnesses, I shall not need to Doubt of My Salvation, altho' I come not to the Length of Mr. Websters Speculations, which by what I can find in Scripture, neither Our Lord, nor Any of the Saints did. And, therefore I Retort this Question, and Ask, To Which of the Saints Mr. W. will Turn, as of the same Vain and Absurd Imaginations with Himself? And Challenge Him, and Any that will take His Part to Shew me One Saint in Scripture, that is not

the same *Selfish Sentiments with Me*, according to what I have above Declared them to be.

His Second Question is, *Dare Any of the Saints say, as He said to some of the Witnesses, that, Were it not for the Prospect of Happiness, He would not serve God?* Answer, I said to *William Harvie*, one of Mr. *Websters* Witnesses (whom I found Just & Learned and Sound on this Head, as He shews Himself to be) that were it not for the Prospect of Happiness, I Could not Serve God, and therefore certainly Would not; And this is what all the Saints, mentioned above, durst say, and must have said, as well as I, if Questioned about it, according to the Apostles Doctrine *Heb. 11. 6. He that Cometh to God must Believe that he is, and that he is a Rewarder of them that Diligently seek Him:* Where we see, that in order to a Persons Coming to God and Seeking Him, it is as Necessary to Believe that He is a *Rewarder of them that Diligently Seek Him*, as to Believe His Existence.

What Mr. *Webster* Subjoins about GODs Enforcing His Law with Promises and Threatnings, and the Influence they should have upon Our Obedience, Discovers that He does not well Understand, or has not duly Considered, either their Nature or Use: For the Promises do not only Contain the Lower Degrees of Pleasure, or Smaller Comforts for Our Encouragement in the Way of Duty here, but also that which is our Chief and Consummate Happiness and Ultimate End. On the other Hand, not only Lesser Evils are Threatened, but the Depriving us of our Chief Happiness, and Plunging us in the Utmost Endless Misery; Wherefore the Promises Containing

the Greatest Good, and the Threatnings Containing the Greatest Evil, if duly Considered, they will not only Work upon our Hopes and Fears, and be Spurs to our Duty, and have a Mighty Influence on our Obedience, as He says; but must Work most Powerfully upon them, above all other Considerations, and be the Sharpest Spur to our Duty, and have the Chief Influence on our Obedience; which yet will not make those who Obey from these Motives, to be Mercenary Servants, seeing they are Moved to Obey, that they may fully Enjoy and Glorifie GOD in Heaven, which is their Greatest Happiness and Chief End.

But Mr. Webster says further, *That GODs Glory is throughout the Scriptures held forth as His Chief End, and is preferred by Him before Our Happiness, and our Blessed Lord falls in with this Design; And He humbly Conceives That our Conformity unto GOD and His Son, in making His Chief End to be Ours, by Eying more than Our Own Happiness, is a Bright Part of the Divine Image in us.* To which I Answer

First, No doubt, as I said above, GODs Chief End with Respect to Man, is, the Glory of all His Excellent Perfections, that are to be Manifested in, by, and upon Mankind; whether by their Happiness or Misery: With which Our Lord as to His Divine Nature Perfectly falls in; and for Example, GOD Prefers the Glory of His Vindictive Justice to the Happiness of the Greatest Part of Mankind, according to Mr. Webster. I Grant also, that *Christ*, as Man, Preferred the Glory of His Fathers Vindictive Justice, &c. to

His

His Own Happiness for a Time: But He neither Did, nor Could Prefer it, to His Eternal Happiness, in the Glorious Enjoyment of GOD for ever; This is what His Father neither Did, nor Could, Agreeable to His Holy and Righteous Nature Require Him to Part with, for Manifesting His Glory; Nor is it Possible, that His Parting therewith could have been a Means to Glorify GOD.

Mr. *Websters* Mistake all along, so far as I can see, Runs upon his Fancying, that the Greatest Joy and Pleasure, whether of Christ or Believers, is Placed upon something else, than upon the Glorious Perfections and Works of GOD, and shewing forth the Glory of them; which if duly Noticed, would Leave no Room for that Question, Whether they Eye GODs Glory more than their Own Happiness, or their Own Happiness more than His Glory; For, *eo ipso*, that they Eye their Own happiness, they Eye his Glory in the most Effectual Manner; And so, Our LORD could not in a higher Degree, Eye the Glory of his Father, than by Eying the Joy that was Set before him, which was Chiefly Placed upon the Glory that would Redound to GOD from his Sufferings.

2ly. I also Grant, as I said above, that Our Chief End must be alwise Subordinate to GODs, and must be a Means to Illustrate some Branch of His Glory: But if Mr. *Webster* take GODs Glory in its full Extent, as his Argument requires, and say, that as it is GODs Chief End, so it must be Ours, I do boldly Affirm, that this can be no Part at all of the Divine Image in us, much less

the Brightest Part of it, no more than our being Omnipotent or Omniscient can be; And that for this Reason, that a Branch of GODs Chief End is, the Manifestation of the Glory of his *Vindictive Justice*, by the Wickedness, Final Impenitency, and Eternal Damnation of Many; Which no Man may or can Propose as his Chief End, nor prefer the Glorifying of it to his own Eternal Happiness, or be Obliged so much as Cheerfully or Submissively to Acquiesce in GODs making him a Vessel of Wrath. Neither can, nor may any Man propose it as his End, to Glorify GODs *Vindictive Justice*, by promoting Directly or Indirectly, the Sin and Damnation of Others, without being Guilty of the Highest Crime: What therefore is GODs Chief End in its full Extent, cannot without Horrid Blasphemy and the Highest Rebellion against Him, be Proposed as our Chief End.

Therefore Mr. Webster had need to Correct these Wild and Dangerous Metaphysicks, which will run him all the Length of the *Mysticks* and *Antinomians*, unless he quite them, and Come in to My Opinion, which is taught in Scripture and our Catechisms. But, tho' he should never go in to My Opinion, as he says he will not, yet I doubt not, but all Men of Good Sense, and Skill in Philosophy and Divinity, will easily agree with Me, that it is most suitable to the Infinite Wisdom, Power and Goodness of GOD, and the Holy Scriptures, that GOD should Create a World of Intelligent Beings, of such a Frame and Make, as to seek their Own Greatest Happiness, as the chief End of all their Ac-

tions;

tions; And that GOD who thus made them, should place their Chief Happiness in Himself, and make their Greatest Pleasure to Consist in being made Like Him, and seeing Him as He is, and in Singing forth the Praises of his Glorious Goodness &c. to all Eternity. These also who have Sound Principles, and Understand aright the Answer to the First Quest of our Catechism will not only say Coldly with Mr Webster, *That they Condemn the Flights of the Mystick Divines and Antinomians; nor will they only Blame for Indiscretion, the Woman who ran about with Fire in one Hand, and Water in the other, to Burn Heaven and Quench Hell; Nor will they think this only a small Right-hand Error, but will Judge it Gross Impiety and Madness.* And I doubt not, they will find my Opinion to be *no Left-hand Error,* but the plain Truth taught in Scripture.

I Grant, it is likely, that Mr. Webster never Read nor heard of any Divine, who made Love to their own Happiness more than to GODs Glory an Essential Ingredient in Good Works; But did he never Read or Hear, that our Glorifying GOD here on Earth, by Faith and good Works, is a Necessary Means, of GODs Appointment, for Obtaining the Gracious Reward of Eternal Happiness, in the full Enjoyment of GOD? And that by Proposing and Seeking to obtain this as our Chief End, by the Foresaid Means, we do most Eminently Glorify GOD? Sure, he has Read little in the Scriptures, and other Books of Divinity, if he has not Read this.

But Mr. W. says further, *If Men be Wise and Holy in their Actions and Aims, They will always have the*

the Greatest Regard to the Greatest Good; and GODs Glory Manifestative is the Greatest Good.

Ans. 1st. Here again Mr. VWebster is aloft with the *Antinomians* and *Mysticks*, and does not Consider that whether Men be Wise and Holy, or not, they must needs have the greatest Regard to what they Conceive to be the Greatest Good to them, whether in it self or with Respect to Another, it be the Greatest Good, or not. And Men, that are Wise and Holy, do by the Word of GOD, and the Power of his Grace, Know, that their Greatest Good lyes in the Eternal Enjoyment of GOD, whereby he shall be chiefly Glorified by them; This therefore they have the greatest Regard unto, tho' it be a *Less Good*, if compared with GODs End, Comprehending the *Full Extent of His Glory*, which I have already proved, Cannot be *Mans Chief End*.

2ly, That it may appear, I am not Singular in this Opinion, besides the Judicious Mr. *Firmin* mentioned above, I shall Name Two other Witnesses, Eminent for Piety and Learning; The One is Dr. *Owen*, who in his Learned Treatise on the Sabbath Exerc. 3. §. 8. hath these words, *The worship of GOD, is that which we are made for, as to our station in this World; and is the Means and Condition of our Enjoyment of Him in Glory, wherein Consists the Ultimat End, as unto us, of our Creation.* The Other is *Joan. Crocius*, Professor of Divinity at *Marpurg*, who, in his Learned Commentarie on the *Epist. to the Eph.* Chap. 1. 4. on these Words, *Ut simus sancti & inculpati*, says, '*Alibi salutem, finem Electionis nominat, dum scribit quod elegit vos ab Initio ad salutem,* 2 Thess.

Class I. Art. VI. &c.

155

2. 13. hoc Capite Gloriam Dei nominat. At hic finem isti ex parte nostra subordinatum exprimat; quod non est alienum. Gloria Dei est absolute summus finis; ex parte Nostra summus est salus; subordinatus, sanctitas.

Upon the Whole of this Article, I Plead, that it is not Relevant; And Crave, that Mr. *Websters* Erroneous Sentiments on this Momentuous Head of Divinity may be duly Considered, that a Timeous Stop may be put to the Spreading of this *Antinomian* Gangrene, through this Church, which there is the more need for, because, not only some of the People are Tainted with it, but it is Preached on the most Solemn Occasions, by some Ministers, as a *Necessary Branch of Self Denyal*, that we be Denied to our own Salvation.

Answer to Libel, Class I. Article VI. and
Class II. Art. II. III. IV.

THIS Article Consists of Three Branches, which make Three Articles in His Second Class of Errors Contained in His Principal Libel, which are these.

1st. *There was no Proper Covenant made betwixt GOD and Adam in Innocence.*

2ly. *That Adam was not a Proper Federal Representative Head of All Mankind.*

3ly. *That there is not a Formal Imputation of Adams First Sin to his Posterity; Only such an Imputation as is often of our Immediat Parents Faults to us, i. e. His Punishing us for the Faults of our Fathers, tho' we do not Sin in them, nor*
Fall

Fall with them in their Personal Sinful Actions.

These Three I shall Answer in Order.

As to the 1st and 2^d, They are so Linked together, that in a great Measure they must be Treated of Joyntly; and Mr. Webster by putting them together in his *Representation*, and alledging, that what I say about them, is Contrary to our *Confession* and *Catechisms*, and also that I Deny the Doctrine about them therein Delivered, Obliges Me first to take Notice of the Propositions which he falsely Charges Me with, Relating to them both.

1st, He Alledges, that My Denying a Proper Covenant to have been made with *Adam*, for Himself and Us, is Contrary to our *Confess.* Chap. 7. §. 2. and Contrary to the *Larger Catechism* Answering the Question, *Did all Mankind fall in Adams first Transgression?* And to the next Q. *Into what Estate did the Fall bring Mankind?* And to that, *Wherein consists the Sinfulness of that Estate whereinto Man fell?* And also to that Quest. *What Misery did the Fall bring upon Mankind?*

Now, I do not call it a False Accusation, when he Alledges, tho' without any Shadow of Reason or Truth, that My Opinion is Contrary to these Passages of Our *Confess.* and *Catech.* But what I notice is, that he gives a Representation of the Meaning of these Passages after his Own Way; To which he adds, *Now the Professor Denys all this* (b): Which, so far as I can see, Imports, that I Deny these Passages of

(b) See Page 29. 30.

of Our Confess. and Catech. To this Charge I Answer,

PROP. I. It is False, *That I Deny the 2d. of Our Confess. Ch. 7.* 'The first Covenant made with Man, was a Covenant of Works, wherein Life was Promised to *Adam*, and in him to his Posterity, upon Condition of Perfect and Personal Obedience. This I Hold, and Yearly Teach.

It is also False, *That I Deny the Answer to that Q. in Our Larg. Catech. Did all Mankind fall in Adams first Transgression?* Which is, 'The Covenant being made with *Adam*, as a 'Publick Person, not for Himself only, but for 'his Posterity; All Mankind Descending from 'him by Ordinary Generation, sinned in him, 'and fell with him in that first Transgression. Every Clause of which Answer I Hold and Yearly Teach, as I do also every Clause of the Answers to the other Three Questions, Mr. *Webster* names; The Words of which, for Brevities Sake, I forbear to set down, and Challenge him to Prove, that I Deny the smallest Clause of any of them.

PROP. II. It is False, *That I Boldly Libel the Westminster Divines for Contradicting Themselves, when I see the Catechisms Assert a Proper Covenant between GOD and Man.* It is also False, *That I say, the Catechisms Account of the Covenant Differs from the Confession.* Both these, he Alledges, I say, in One of My Letters to Mr. *Roman* (c); The Falshood whereof will evidently

dently appear, by setting down Two Passages of My Letter dated Jan. 14. 1712. The First is, ' You say, first, It is Contrary to Our Confess. Ch. 7. §. 1. 2. Which I cannot see, because, altho' that Dispensation be called a Covenant, as I also call it; Yet, It, neither there, Nor in our Catechisms, is called a Covenant in the Proper and Strict Sense, as a Covenant is Distinct from, and Opposed to a Law. And, sure, it is not so much as a Reflection in the smallest Degree, upon Our Confession, to say, that a Word in it is not to be taken in the most Strict and Proper Sense; Seeing many such are in GODs Word. And I shew Mr. Rowan, that the Word Covenant is thus Used in Scripture. And a little below I tell him, ' That the Description of the Covenant of Works, Confess. Ch. 7. §. 2. Agrees to a Law, and hath the same Sense, as if it were said, *The first Covenant was a Law of Works, &c.* And so, wherever this Covenant is mentioned in Our Confession and Catechisms, if you put the Word Law for it, with a futable Change of the Particles, the Sense will be the same: And thus the Scripture Proofs will agree to the Thing Proved, and not Otherwise; for all of them have the Word Law. By these Words, I hope, every Person of common Understanding, will Perceive, I tell Mr. Rowan, that the Word Covenant, when applyed to the Covenant of Works, both in our Confession and Catechisms, is taken Improperly, for what is truly a Law.

To this I add a following Passage of the same Letter, in Answer to an Inference of Mr. Rowan,

viz.

viz. *Removing the Federal Relation to Adam, Imputing his Sin is Removed.* To which I Answer in these words. "Now, this which you lay down as a Maxim, is a False Proposition, and Contrary to *Our Confess* Ch 6. §. 3. *They being the Root of All Mankind, the Guilt of this Sin was Imputed, &c.* Where 'tis founded on the Natural Relation, to which I perfectly agree; and not on the Federal. I grant, *Our Catechisms* seem to fix it on the Federal Relation, if the Word *Covenant* be taken in the *Strict Sense*; and so *They* will Differ from the *Confession*. Which Difference must be ascribed to the Different Opinions of these, who made the Plurality in Different Sessions of that Assembly; Or to a Design of Satisfying all Parties, in these Things that seemed Disputable, and without Danger on Either Side. From which Consideration, they sometimes Abstracted from the Opposite Opinions of Both Sides, whereof there are many Instances both in the *Confession* and *Catechisms*, as doubtless you know: But, if the Word *Covenant* be taken *Improperly*, then they will Agree.

Where 'tis Manifest, I tell Mr. *Roman*, that, if the Word *Covenant* be taken *Improperly*, both in *Our Confession* and *Catechisms*, then they will Agree together: But if it be taken for a *Strict* and *Proper Covenant* in the *Catechisms*, as he would have it, then *They* will Differ from the *Confession*. And, as a fair Reasoner, I tell him what I thought the Best Way, he could account for this Difference, which Necessarily follow'd from his Opinion. And I now say the same thing to Mr. *Webster*; and am still of Opinion, that he cannot

cannot find a Better Reason of the Difference; that must needs be between the *Confession* and *Catechisms*, if the Word *Covenant*, when applyed to the *Covenant of Works* in our *Catechisms*, must be taken for a *Proper Covenant*: So that, if this be a *Libelling* of the *Westminster Divines*, as I think it is not, the Burthen of it lies upon Mr. *Rowans* and Mr. *Websters* Opinion, and not upon Mine, which leaves no Room for a *seeming Difference* between them.

These are the Passages of my *Letters* to Mr. *Rowan*, on which, so far as I can see, he founds this Charge of My *Libelling the Assembly*, &c. And, I hope, 'tis Evident to every Person of Sense and Ingenuity, that my Words do not afford the least Shadow of a Pretext for it; And I Challenge him to Produce any Passage out of these *Letters*, that does either Assert it, or any thing from which it may be justly Inferred.

An Account of My Opinion, upon the first Branch of this *Article*.

1st. **I** Hold and Teach the Express Words and Doctrine of Our *Confession of Faith*, about the *Covenant of Works*, Chap. 4. § 2. "After God had made all other Creatures, He Created Man, Male and Female,----- having the Law of God Written in their Hearts.----- Besides this Law Written in their Hearts, they received a Command, not to Eat of the Tree of Knowledge of Good and Evil, which whilst they kept, they were Happy in their Communion with God, and had Dominion over the Crea-

"tures.

tures. And Ch. 7. §. 2. The first Covenant made with Man, was a Covenant of Works, wherein Life was Promised to Adam; and in him to his Posterity, upon Condition of Perfect and Personal Obedience. And also the Doctrine of Our Catechisms, about this Covenant, in Answer to that Question, in the Larger Catechism. *What was the Providence God exercised towards Man, in the Estate wherein he was Created?* With the Two following, and the Others mentioned by Mr. Webster, with the parallel Questions in the Lesser Catechism, without Denying or Dissenting from one Clause or Title contained in them.

2d. I Hold and Teach, that this Dispensation of Gods Will to Adam in Innocence, which, in Confession, Chap. 4. §. 2. is called a Law and Command; when, Chap. 7. §. 2. and also in Our Catechisms, It is called a Covenant; Then the Word Covenant is not to be understood of a Proper Covenant, in the Strict Sense of Lawyers, for such Contracts between Man and Man as are entered into by Stipulation, Restipulation, and Astipulation.

And here I take care to Explain the Terms, Law and Covenant, when taken in the Strict Sense of Lawyers, as they are *Modi Obligandi Specie distincti*, taking a Law for an Obligation laid on by the Authority of a Lawful Superior; And a Covenant I take in the more General Notion of a Convention or Pactio, and Describe it to be, An Obligation Contracted by Promise and Acceptance between Two Parties; Whereof a Covenant entered into by Stipulation, Restipulation, &c. is a Species, being a Mutual Pactio entered into by Mutual Promises, and Mutual Acceptance of the Parties;

or, by *their Asking and Giving Mutual Promises which lays on a Mutual Obligation.*

Moreover, I take Pains to Prove to the Students, that the Word *Covenant* is frequently used, both in Scripture and other Authors, in a Large Improper Sense, for Any Sort of Obligation, or any Way of Contracting an Obligation, so that sometimes it Signifies the same Thing with a Law, its Opposite Species; As, on the other Hand, the Word *Law* is taken oftentimes in the same Large Sense. Whence I Conclude that the Authors of Our Excellent *Confession* and *Catechisms* do only Use the Word *Covenant* in a Sense wherein it is oft Used in the Holy Scriptures, viz. for what is properly a Law in the Strict Sense of Lawyers, just now Mentioned. And the Reason why they so Use it, is, Because the Law of GOD hath this Singular in it, that the Sanction thereof contains a Promise of a Glorious Reward to the Obedient, of Enjoying GOD as their Eternal Happiness, which does not necessarily flow from the Nature of a Law in general and therefore, *Man could have no Right to it, except by the Voluntary Condescension of GOD*; as the Authors of Our *Confession* say Expressly, Chap. 7. §. 1. And so far it hath something of the Nature of a Covenant or Paction, seeing GOD Obliges Himself to Man by His Promise.

These Things I Dictated to the Students Three Years ago, to Prevent Mistakes into which some of them were ready to fall: Whence 'tis evident, that I Teach Nothing Contrary to Our *Confession* or *Catechisms*, with Respect to the Name of *that Dispensation*. For, as in *them*, both Names are given to it, so I Use them both Indifferently

ifferently; And when I say, the Word Cove-
nant is not to be Understood of a Strict and Pro-
per Covenant, I do not in the least Contradict
them; Because this Dispensation is no where in
them called a *Proper Covenant*; nor is there
any thing in them ascribed to it, that is Pec-
uliar to a Proper Covenant, as above Explain'd.

But Mr. *Webster* alledges, that My Denying the
Covenant of Works to be a *Proper Covenant*, is Con-
trary to Our Confession, Ch. 7. §. 2.

To which I Answer, I Teach, ' That GOD
Commanded Obedience and Promised Life, and
Forbad Sinning, and Threatned Death, and all
this to *Adam* for himself and us; And Re-
vealed to our First Parents all this; either by
an Impression on their Soul, or Otherwise; And
that they had their own Stock, and the Stock of
all their Posterity in their Hand, and that they
Stood and Fell for their Posterity; And they
being Perfect, did chearfully Acquiesce in that
Revelation made to them; And upon their
Fulfilling a Course of Obedience, prescrib'd to
them by the Lord, they might have certainly
laid Claim to the Promise of Life, and seek the
Reward: And, that the Tree of Life was a
Sacrament, Symbol or Pledge, to Confirm the Pro-
mise of Life.

Now, this is Mr. *Websters* Own Account of the
Covenant of Works, given in his *Representation* (d)
and made use of by him, to Prove, that it is a
Proper Covenant, and by which *Adam* is made
the *Publick Representative* of his Posterity. In
all which I perfectly Agree with him, and Teach

L 2 the

the same Things, except that neither the Name nor Nature of a Proper Covenant agrees to it; there being nothing at all Peculiar to a Proper Covenant in Mr. *Websters* Large Account of it, as may appear by a Review of it. Whereas he says, *God Commanded Obedience and Promised Life, Forbade Sinning and Threatned Death, and Revealed this to Adam*; Here we have all the Essentials of Law Properly taken, or an Obligation laid on by the Interposition of the GREAT Sovereigns Authority, as Our Confess. Ch. 7. §. 2. also Teaches Which Law was given to Adam, not only for Himself, but for his Posterity, as all Common Law use to be. Adam also had the Stock of his Posterity in his Hand, being Endued with Original Righteousness, which he was to Convey to his Posterity, in case of Obedience; And upon his first Transgression, was to Lose it, not only for Himself, but for his Posterity (in case after his Fall he should be allow'd to Beget any), who, as a part of the Punishment of His Sin, were to be Born with the same Unclean and Corrupt Nature, which the Transgression of this Law should bring upon Adam, the Root of All Mankind; as Our Confession Teaches, Chap. 6. §. 3. Adam also, without Doubt, Acquiesced in this Law, as Holy, Just, and Good; Yet this can no more turn the mentioned Law into a Proper Covenant, than the Satisfaction of Subjects with Good Laws Imposed on them by an Absolute Monarch, does turn them into Covenants between Him and Them. It is very True, God Obliged Himself by Promise to Adam, who thereby had a Claim to Seek the Reward Promis'd, upon Condition of Obedience; But this

is a Thing very very Agreeable to the Nature of a Law: And the Law of God Necessarily Implies some Degree of Reward to the Obedient. Moreover, the Confirming this Law by an outward Sign or Symbol (such as the Tree of Life was) is a Rite very Agreeable to the Solemn Ratification of a Law, as well as of a Covenant. So that, in all Mr. *Websters* Account of this Dispensation, there is not the Least Thing that Belongs to a Proper Covenant, as it is Specifically Different from a Law. Yea, Mr. *Webster* himself does plainly Own, That GOD laid the Obligation on *Adam* to Perform his Duty, by a Command, enforc'd by a Promise of Life, and a Threatning of Death, as Our *Confession*, Chap. 7. §. 2. does; Which laid upon him a much Stronger Obligation, than if He had taken his Promise for it: And this is the very *Specifick Difference* of a Law as 'tis a *Distinct Species* from a Covenant.

The same thing is to be said of the Account given in Our *Confession of Faith* and *Catechisms*, of the Covenant of Works, where there is Nothing Peculiar to a Proper Covenant Ascrib'd to it. The same holds True of the Texts of Scripture made use of in *Them*, to Prove this Doctrine; In all of which it is called a Law, and not One of them calls it a Covenant; Yea, even in *Rom. 5.* from v. 12, to 20. which Mr. *Webster* would have Read, where there is Mention made of a Law, but not of a Covenant; as v. 13. For until the LAW, Sin was in the World, but Sin is not Imputed where there is no LAW: Where we may also see, that the Apostle founds the Imputation of Sin upon a Law, and not upon a Covenant; which agrees very well

the same Things, except that neither the Nature nor Nature of a Proper Covenant agrees to it; there being nothing at all Peculiar to a Proper Covenant in Mr. *Websters* Large Account of it, as may appear by a Review of it. Whereas he says, *God Commanded Obedience and Promised Life, Forbade Sinning and Threatned Death, and Revealed the Law to Adam*; Here we have all the Essentials of Law Properly taken, or an Obligation laid on by the Interposition of the GREAT Sovereigns Authority, as Our Confess. Ch. 7. §. 2. also Teaches Which Law was given to *Adam*, not only for Himself, but for his Posterity, as all Common Law use to be. *Adam* also had the Stock of his Posterity in his Hand, being Endued with Original Righteousness, which he was to Convey to his Posterity, in case of Obedience; And upon his first Transgression, was to Lose it, not only for Himself, but for his Posterity (in case after his Fall he should be allow'd to Beget any), who, as a part of the Punishment of His Sin, were to be Born with the same Unclean and Corrupt Nature, which the Transgression of this Law should bring upon *Adam*, the Root of All Mankind; as Our Confession Teaches, Chap. 6. §. 3. *Adam* also, without Doubt, Acquiesced in this Law, as Holy, Just, and Good; Yet this can no more turn the mentioned Law into a Proper Covenant, than the Satisfaction of Subjects with Good Laws Imposed on them by an Absolute Monarch, does turn them into Covenants between Him and Them. It is very True, God Obligated Himself by Promise to *Adam*, who thereby had a Claim to Seek the Reward Promis'd, upon Condition of Obedience; But this

is a Thing very very Agreeable to the Nature of a Law: And the Law of God Necessarily Implies some Degree of Reward to the Obedient. Moreover, the Confirming this Law by an outward Sign or Symbol (such as the Tree of Life was) is a Rite very Agreeable to the Solemn Ratification of a Law, as well as of a Covenant. So that, in all Mr. *Websters* Account of this Dispensation, there is not the Least Thing that Belongs to a Proper Covenant, as it is Specifically Different from a Law. Yea, Mr. *Webster* himself does plainly Own, That GOD laid the Obligation on *Adam* to Perform his Duty, by a Command, enforc'd by a Promise of Life, and a Threatning of Death, as Our *Confession*, Chap. 7. §. 2. does; Which laid upon him a much Stronger Obligation, than if He had taken his Promise for it: And this is the very *Specifick Difference* of a Law 'tis a *Distinct Species* from a Covenant.

The same thing is to be said of the Account given in Our *Confession of Faith* and *Catechisms*, of the Covenant of Works, where there is Nothing Peculiar to a Proper Covenant Ascrib'd to it. The same holds True of the Texts of Scripture made use of in *Them*, to Prove this Doctrine; In all of which it is called a Law, and not One of them calls it a Covenant; Yea, even in *Rom. 5.* from v. 2, to 20. which Mr. *Webster* would have Read, where is Mention made of a Law, but not of a Covenant; as v. 13. For until the LAW, Sin was in the World, but Sin is not Imputed where there is no LAW: Where we may also see, that the apostle founds the Imputation of Sin upon a Law, and not upon a Covenant; which agrees very well

with the whole Context, where Mention is made of *One Mans Sin and Disobedience*, but not on the Word of a *Breach of Promise or Covenant*. Seeing therefore, all that is in this Dispensation, either as Taught in Our *Confession* and *Catechisms*, or as Described by Mr. *Webster* himself, agrees to *Proper Law*, and contains nothing *Peculiar* to *Proper Covenant*; And seeing it is ordinarily in Scripture called a *Law*, as in all the Texts adduced by the Authors of Our *Confession* and *Catechisms*, to Prove a *Covenant of Works*; I think this might Decide the Controversy, in favour of its being *Justly* Called a *Proper Law*, and Satisfy us, that 'tis only Called a *Covenant* in an *Improper* and *Large Sense* of the Word; And might also Convince us, that the Learned Authors of Our *Confession* Understood the Word *Covenant* in the *Large Sense*; Seeing *That* to which They Apply it, is Called a *Law*, in all the Texts They Adduce for Proof of It.

From all which I Conclude, that My Denying the *Covenant of Works* to be a *Proper Covenant* in the *Strict Sense* of Lawyers, is not Contrary to Our *Confession*, Chap. 7. §. 2. Seeing I Call it as *They* Do, and Understand the same Thing by it, which both *They* and Mr. *Webster* Do; And for the same Reason, My Opinion is not Contrary to the *Answers* to the *Questions* of the *Large Catechism*, Objected by Mr. *Webster* and Mention'd above.

Now, as to all the rest of His Long Representation on this Head, I think, it neither Deserves nor Needs any further Answer; seeing all the Consequences he Draws from My Opinion, be they

never

ever so Black and Erroneous, do Equally Fol-
 low from His Opinion and Mine, and also from
 the Doctrine of Our *Confession* and *Catechisms*,
 seeing He and I are fully of the same Opinion with
 Them, as to what is Meant by the Covenant of
 Works; Unless it can be supposed, that there is
 some Powerful Charm in Giving it the Name of a
Proper Covenant, or saying, it has the Nature of a
Proper Covenant, by Vertue whereof it can Produce
 Wonderful Effects, which it hath no more Power to
 do, so soon as it is Robbed of this *Mighty Name*, A
 PROPER COVENANT, wherein its very
 Soul and Efficacy lyes. Some Things scattered up
 and down this Part of His *Representation* will
 come to be Noticed, on the Other Two Branches.
 I only here Remark One Thing, that Mr. Web-
 ster Grants, *he has Heard some say, that the Cove-*
nant of Grace is not so Properly a Covenant as the
Covenant of Works: And I suppose, he Dare not
 Deny this to be His Own Opinion. Now, if it be
 No Sufficient Article of a Libel against Him, or O-
 thers, who say, *the Covenant of Grace is not a Pro-*
per Covenant; With what Face can he bring it a-
 gainst Me as a Censurable Fault, that I say, *the*
Covenant of Works is not so Properly a Covenant,
as are Ordinary Contracts between Man and Man.
 For Our *Confession* and *Catechisms* Call them Both
Covenants, but Call Neither of them a *Proper Co-*
venant; So that, if that Excuse Them, it will
 also Excuse Me. Only, there is this Advantage
 on My Side, that the *Confession* Calls the Cove-
 nant of Works a *Law*, and gives a Description of
 it Containing Nothing Peculiar to a *Proper Cove-*
nant: Whereas, the Description it gives of the

Covenant of Grace, *Chap. 7. §. 3.* hath, at least, all the Essentials of a Proper Convention or Pactum. The Words are, ----- 'The Covenant of Grace wherein He freely Offereth unto Sinners, Life and Salvation by JESUS CHRST; Requiring of them Faith in Him, that they may be Saved; And Promising to Give unto all those that are Ordained unto Life, His Holy Spirit, to make them Willing, and Able to Believe. Where we see an Offer is made of the most valuable Blessings and the Acceptance of them is Required, and that even as a Condition to Interest a Person in them; And the *Larger Catechism* well Explains it, in the Answer to that Question, *How is the Grace of God Manifested in the Second Covenant?* By which 'tis Plain that the Notion of these Divines, Mr. Webster speaks of, is the Reverse almost of the Doctrine of our Confession, with which Doctrine seeing Mr. Opinion doth exactly Agree, it is no Wonder, it be almost the Reverse of the Notion of these Divines, which runs cross to the Description of the Covenant of Grace, given in Our Confession and *Larger Catechism*, And also to That of the Covenant of Works.

It is not much My Concern at present, either to Justify or Condemn the Divines, who Assert the Absoluteness of the Covenant of Grace. I know several of them, of whom I am One, who Abhor Antinomianism, both Name and Thing; But Others I fear, tho', I hope, beside their Intention, do Mislead Ignorant People into Antinomian Errors by their Unwary Expressions and Abuse of Words. And some of them also set up for a Covenant of Works under the Gospel, or, as they love to Call

ft, all
ction
Grace
fe an
f the
An
rdain
the
e see
ffing
d tha
m; A
Answ
Man
Plain
Webste
cting
g My
der, i
se D
of the
z an
Cove
either
ert the
w Se
Abba
thers
n, do
errors
Words
nt of
o Cal
it

at A Covenant of Duties; Which, in the Opinion of Moe than Mr. Webster and Me, may seem to Turn Things Upside Down. But the present Question hath little to do with them, whether they Own a Covenant of Works with Adam or not; Or, whether they make an Engagement to Sincere Obedience a Condition of the Covenant of Grace, or not: And I see no Use of such Innuendo's here, but to be a Slanderous Insinuation.

Before I leave this, I must Notice, that Mr. Webster in the 2d Part of his Representation (e) says, *That this Distinction of a Proper and Improper Covenant, Palmed on the Express Words of our Confession, is only My Art, to save My Self from an Express Contradicting of the Confession.* I Wish, he had Told the Express Words of the Confession, on which this Distinction is Palm'd; Sure, they cannot be the Description of the Covenant of Works, Chap. 7. §. 2. As, I hope, is Manifest from what I have said. But, I Desire Him, and his Friends, who think, *the Covenant of Grace is not so Properly a Covenant*, to take heed, lest this Distinction be by them Palm'd on the Express Words of our Confession, Chap. 7. §. 3. and the parallel Question of the Larger Catechism mention'd above; And to Beware of Using any such Mean Art, to Save Themselves from an Express Contradicting of these Articles. As for My Opinion, it needs no such Art; And, if it did, Mr. Websters Opinion of the Covenant of Works, related above, would make it as Necessary to Him. For, if he Adhere to that Description of

of it, he must either Own, that it is not a Proper Covenant in the Sense of Lawyers, or Expose his Ignorance, in not Knowing the Difference between a Proper Law and a Proper Covenant. And I am of Opinion, he will get no Skill'd Lawyer or Divine to Approve the Learned Definition of a Proper Covenant, that he gave before the Ministers at *Edinburgh, Aug. 20. 1713.* Namely, *That it is a Law with a Double Sanction; Which, upon my Asking his Meaning, he Explained to be A Law Enforced with Rewards and Punishments.* And truly, if this be all he means by a Proper Covenant, as I said then, so say I now, He and I do not Differ, but about Names. Only, I would have him Notice what he seems not aware of, namely, that from this Proper Covenant of His will not follow the same Consequences and Effects which, according to the Rules of Justice and Equity, do follow from what Lawyers and Divines Call a Proper Covenant; Much less, these Effects which follow only from some Kinds of them: And I desire, he may beware of falling into such a Blunder, as if a Man should Call *that Figure a Circle*, which *Mathematicians* Call a *Square*, and then should Assign to *his Circle* the same Properties which *Mathematicians* Assign to Their *Circles*; whereas, in Truth, his *Circle* only Admits of the Properties which *Mathematicians* Ascribe to their *Square*.

I should here End this Branch of the Article, were it not, that Mr. *Webster* says, in the following Words of the said Representation (f), I

do not Know One Sound Divine, that Asserts the Transaction with Adam, was a Covenant in an Improper Sense. And tho' all our Divines do not say, it is a Covenant Properly so Called, yet their Management in that Matter Asserts the Equivalent. Therefore, to Inform him better, I shall Name Some, who Expressly Call it a Covenant not Properly so Taken, or by their Management shew the Equivalent.

I. *Franciscus Junius*, whom, I hope, Mr. Webster will Own to be a Sound Divine, in his *Thef. Theolog. de Fœd. & Testam. Divinis*, having Describ'd the Covenant of Works, *Thef. 3.* says of it, *Thef. 4. Fœdus sive Pactum dicimus non propria illa Significatione, qua pro mutuo Contractu, & duarum Partium Dispositione sumitur.*

The 2d I Name is *Hoornbeek*, who, in the Passage Cited out of him by Mr. Webster, Calls it *Tacitum & Virtuale Fœdus*, And, *Disput. Theol. Prima, de Fœdere DEI, Thef. 2.* hath these Words, *Quippe inter DEUM & Hominem, non proprie Contractus, qualis inter nos mutuo, iniri intelligendus.*

The 3d is *Rutherford*, who, in his *Exam. Armin. P. 314.* Cited by Mr. Webster, in Answer to that Question, *An tale Pactum probari possit, quo Adami Peccatum omnibus ipsius Posteris Imputatur?* (Which the Remonstrants Denied, and He affirm'd) says, for Proof of his Opinion,
 ' I. Quia Scriptura ait non semel nos in Peccato
 ' nasci, in Adamo peccasse, per unius offensam
 ' Peccatores constitui; Hoc autem non factum
 ' est Natura, ergo Pacto & Speciali DEI Lege.

Which

Which last Words Mr. *Webster* cautiously left out, that it might not appear, that Mr. *Rutherford* Determin'd Against Him, and For Me. For I also maintain against the *Arminians*, that GOD made such a Covenant with *Adam*, or, to speak according to Law Terms, gave him such a Law, by which his Sin was Imputed to all his Natural Posterity. And, as I Call it a Law, or a Covenant, so does Mr. *Rutherford*: And in his 2d Argument he gives this Reason why he Calls it *Pactum* or *Fœdus*, viz. *Ubi est Promissio & Comminatio inflicta, ibi est Fœdus & Pactum*, &c. Which Words Express only the Sanction of a Law, but nothing Peculiar to a Proper Covenant: Accordingly, in the End of this Paragraph he Calls it *Pactum Legale*; So, it cannot be thought, Mr. *Rutherford* took the Covenant of Works to be a Proper Covenant, unless we could suppose, he was Ignorant of the Peculiar Differences of a Proper Covenant and a Proper Law; which his Words give no Ground for. And, that he meant no such Thing as a Proper Covenant, does also appear from his Book *de Provid. Cap. 18. P. 211. 212.* quoted by Mr. *Webster*, as will be Evident to any who Reads the whole Passage, too large to be here Inserted. He is there Proving, *Quod DEUS voluit Peccatum fieri se permittente*: One of his Arguments is, ' *Quia DEUS*
' *ex Fœdere Primo, quod solo liberrimo & sapiente suo Arbitrio fecit cum Adamo, hanc Legem tulit, ut si Adamus peccaret, in eo peccante peccarent omnes ipsius Posterit.-----DEUS*
' *potuit siquidem ita ei visum fuisset, Legem tulisse,*
' *quæ, si Adamus peccaret, ipse solus reus foret,*

& Posterij ejus omnes Innocentes nascerentur.
Et cum nos nondum nati eramus, patet nullo
actu Personali nos posse eum fluxum poenalem
impedire, quippe Creaturam declinare Poenam a
Creatore inflictam non est possibile. Then fol-
low the Objection and Answer mention'd by Mr.
Webster. By which Passage it is Manifest,

1st, That Mr. Rutherford founds the Impu-
tation of Adams Sin to his Posterity, and the
fluxus poenalis Peccati or Propagation of Orig-
inal Sin to them, upon an Arbitrary Constitution
and Law of GOD, by which he evidently means
the Sanction of the Law of Works.

2dly, His Words also plainly Declare, that A-
dams Posterity could have no Manner of Acces-
sion, either to Adams Fact of Eating the For-
bidden Fruit (as I Assert Twice in the above
mention'd Letter to Mr. Rowan), or to the Propa-
gation of Original Sin; Seeing, as he says, the
whole flowed from an Arbitrary Constitution of
God, which they could not Hinder.

3dly, From the Objection and Answer it is
Manifest, that he thinks, that the Communion of
Human Nature Alone, is not a Sufficient Ground
for the Communion of a Law, and of Sin, between
a Father and a Son: Wherein I am of the same
Mind with him; Which Mr. Webster knew very
well; Altho' he think fit to say, that the Ob-
jection is just My Scheme: Whereas, on the con-
trary, I Found the Imputation and Propagation of
Adams Sin to his Posterity, upon the Natural Re-
velation, and the Particular Sanction of the Law of
Works; as our Confession does, Ch. 6. §. 3. com-
pared with the Two preceeding Paragraphs, and
with

with Chap. 4. § 2. and as Mr. *Rutherford* does in the Passage here Cited; Unless by his saying *Hoc nihil ad rem*, be meant, that the Natural Relation is wholly Excluded from any Influence on the Imputation of *Adams* Sin, or Propagation of Corruption to his Posterity; Which cannot be his Meaning; for, so he would Contradict Our Confession, Chap. 6. § 3.

I shall Name Another, who says, the Covenant of Works is not a Proper Covenant, viz. Mr. *Giles*, in his *Ark of the Covenant*, Chap. 3. p. 102. where he says, "In Covenants between Man and Man, the Conditions and Covenant do not Bind, except they be Consented unto; but Gods Covenant Tarrieth not for Mans Consent, ----- Nor doth the Obligation thereof Depend upon Mans Consent. For which he giveth this Reason, For, His Covenant is a Law; And says, that this holdeth both of the Covenant of Nature and of Grace.

I Add also *Turretin*, Loc. 8. Quæst. 3. § 1. *Certum est Fœdus Dei cum Homine, Stricte loquendo, Intercedere non posse.* I might Add *Amesius*, *Owen*, and Others, were it Needfull.

I Proceed to the II. BRANCH of this Article, where I am Charged for Teaching Error, in Denying Adam to be a Federal Head to his Posterity.

To which I Answer, 1st, If all that is meant by a Federal Head, be, that Adam was such a Publick Person and Representative of his Posterity, as the Law or Covenant of Works, above Explain'd, could make him; In that Sense, I do not Deny, but Own Adam to be a Federal Head

Head to his Posterity. Only, I think it a New, Improper, and Unwary Designation, that is not Used in Our *Confession* and *Catechisms*, nor in any *Confession* of the Reform'd Churches, or the Writings of Our Reformers; Which have not one Word of a Proper Covenant made with *Adam*, or of *Adams* being a Federal Head: And I find it very Liable to be Mistaken, and to give our Adversaries a Handle to Misrepresent our Doctrine, and to Impugn it with Arguments not Easy to be Answered. I therefore think it my Duty, to Warn the Students of this; And Choose rather to make Use of more Proper Terms, agreeable to such as are in Our Own and Other *Confessions*, and the Writings of the Reformers; who, in my Opinion, have Explained the Law, or Covenant of Works, and *Adams* Representation flowing therefrom, together with its Effects, in the Imputation and Propagation of Sin, in a Way much more Agreeable to Scripture and Reason, and less liable to Objections, than our Later Divines have Done: And I know no Law Obliging Me to Follow the Later rather than the Elder.

2dly, If by a *Federal Head*, be Meant, that *Adam* is Constituted such a Head, by Vertue of a Proper Covenant, in the Strict Sense of *Lawyers*; Or, that he Represented his Posterity in such a Strict and Proper Covenant that God made with him; In this Sense, I Deny, that he is a *Federal Head*; And, Mr. Webster must also Deny it, if he Adhere to his Own Account of the Covenant of Works, mentioned above, and to the Doctrine of Our *Confession* and *Catechisms*, and of *Junius*, *Rutherford*, *Hoornbeek*, and other Divines just now mention'd. But,

But, if, notwithstanding of all these; he Will have *Adam* to be a Federal Representative of his Posterity in such a Strict and Proper Covenant, he must needs Produce another Foundation of this Federal Headship, than the *Law of our Creation with Promises and Threatnings Annex'd to it*: For altho, that Law, or Covenant, does Constitute *Adam* a Publick Person, and such a Representative of his Posterity, as that thereby his First Sin is Imputed to them, and they Derive Corrupted Natures from him, or Sin in him, and Fall with him in his First Transgression; Yet, it neither does, nor can make him to Represent them in a Strict and Proper Covenant. And, if he Fancy, there is some *Divine Constitution* Different from *this Law of Works*, as above Explained by himself; by which *Adam* is made such a Federal Head, I Wish, he would be so Kind as to shew it: For, as I said in my foresaid Letter to Mr. *Roman*, so say I now to him; *Such a Divine Appointment I have not as yet found in My Bible*. But, if he Alledge no other Ground for this Federal Headship, as I think he cannot, except the foremention'd Law, or Covenant of Works; then He and I are fully Agreed about the Thing, and only Differ about the Name: And therefore, as I said on the former Branch, all his Consequences follow Equally from His Opinion and Mine; Such as, *Our Sinning or not Sinning in Adam*, And, *Having his Sin it self Imputed or not Imputed*, &c. Unless there be some *Powerful Magick in the Name*, which I am yet to Learn. So I Proceed to the

III. BRANCH, where I shall First take Notice of some Propositions in His *Libel* and Representa-

Willion, that He Falsly Charges Me with, and then
F hisive an Account of Mine Own Opinion.

PROP I. *That Imputation of Sin is nothing
ant, thiself, but the Connexion betwixt the Sin of One,
tionand the Punishment, or Loss, that Another Sustains
Forit (g). This I Deny to be My Description, or
e Account of the Imputation of Sin.*

PROP. II. *All the Imputation of Adams First
in, that I Own, is, Our being Corrupted by Our
himDescent from Adam, Our Natural Head, by the
does, Laws of Generation, as the Effect of His First Sin.
trich). This Proposition is so far from being Mine,
re isat I think it Nonsense to say, that Our being
aw ofCorrupted by Our Descent from Adam, &c. is ei-
whichther the Imputation of Adams First Sin, or all
h, heImputation of it. In My Opinion, Our De-
said, scending Corruption from Adam, is the Consequence
now, of that Imputation, and the Punishment of his Sin,
not aswhich is thereby Charged to Our Account.*

PROP. III. *That the Derivation of Original
in from Adam to his Posterity, flows meerly from
Co- their Partaking of the same Humane Nature with
greedim (i). This I Deny to be My Opinion; And
ameassert, that to the Natural Relation must be Ad-
anch, ed, as the Principal Cause of this, the Sanction
s O- of the Law, or Covenant of Works, Enjoyed to
t SinAdam in a State of Perfection.*

PROP. IV. *That there is Only such an Im-
et toputation of Adams first Sin to his Posterity, as is
Noticeoften of Our Immediate Parents Faults to us (k).*

M

Which

Which *Proposition*, with Mr. *Websters* (i. e.) by way of Explication, I Deny to be Mine, either as to Words, or Sense.

I do Own, that some Sins of Immediate Parents are Formally and Properly Imputed to their Posterity, as well, or as truly, as *Adams* First Sin is to all his Posterity: Yet, I Maintain, that the Effects and Properties of the Imputation of *Adams* Sin to his Posterity, do vastly Differ from the Effects and Properties of the Imputation of the Sins of Immediate Parents to their Posterity; Which Difference flows from the Different Sanction of the Laws, and the Different Punishments therein Denounc'd, according to which the Sin of *Adam*, or the Sins of Immediate Parents are Imputed; And the Posterity of *Adam*, or Children of Other Parents, are thereby made Liable to Punishments of a Different Nature, Extent, Duration, &c. as the Sanction of the Laws, from which the several Imputations flow, does Appoint: In both which Cases, the Imputation is Formal and Proper. And this is only what our Common Systems Teach; As *Turret.* Loc. 9. Quest. 9. whose 3d Argument for the Imputation of *Adams* Sin is, *Quia Proximorum Parentum Peccata, justo Dei Judio, non raro transeunt in Liberos, & iis Imputantur; Ergo &c.* Which he Proves by Many Examples, such as these of the Children of *Achan*, the *Amalekites*, &c.

PROP. V. That there is No Proper or Formal Imputation of *Adams* First Sin to his Posterity; And, that, with the *Socinians*, I Deny the

Reatus

Reatus Peccati Adæ; And, that all the Imputation of Adams Sin to his Posterity, that I Own, is, That by Occasion thereof we fall into Misery (1).

To which I Answer, 1st, That, whereas Mr. Webster Alledges, in his Libel, that in the Conference with the Ministers at Edinburgh, I did Assert and Declare, That there is not a Formal Imputation of Adams first Sin to his Posterity, but only such an Imputation, as is often of Our Immediat Parents Faults to us; To which also, as I said, he adds an Explication of his Own: I Deny, that I then Asserted or Declared any such Thing; And do say, that Mr. Websters Memory must have Fail'd him Extremely, when he here Charges me with the Contradictory of what I said at That Time: For, being aware of the Failures of his Memory, and his Quibbling about Words, I would not Answer his Questions, Except in Writing; I shall therefore Insert His Question on this Head, with My Answer.

Quest. Is Adams First Sin Formally Imputed to his Posterity? Or, is it in this Sense Only Imputed, that by the Laws of Generation Established by GOD, and by Our Natural Conjunction with the First Man, a Corrupt Father Begets a Corrupt Child; and so, the Imputation of Adams Sin is in the Effects Only?

Ans. ' GOD does Justly and Formally Impute Adams First Sin to his Posterity, and, ' by the Established Laws mentioned, does In-

‘ flict upon them the Punishment Due for it: And
 ‘ were it not for the Imputation of his First Sin
 ‘ there would be neither a Corrupt Father, nor any
 ‘ Corrupt Child Begotten. As for the Imputation
 ‘ of Sin in the Effects, it is a Way of Speak-
 ‘ ing that is New to Me, which I do not Com-
 ‘ prehend the Sense of.

I have Sufficient Evidence, to Prove, that This is the True Answer, I then Read to him, if he shall Call it in Question. I Remember, that, after I had Read this, Mr. *Webster* Alledged, that he had heard from One of my Scholars, that I Maintain’d, that the Sin of One Person could not be Imputed to Another; which, I told him, was certainly a wrong Information: For, it was My Constant Opinion, that the Sin of One Person might be Imputed to Another, and that some Sins of other Parents might be Imputed to Their Posterity, as well as the First Sin of *Adam* to all His Posterity. Upon which he Replied, *That now all was out, and that I Maintain’d that there was no Difference between the Imputation of Adams First Sin to His Posterity, and the Imputation of the Sins of any Other Parents to Their Posterity.* To which I answered, That this would not follow upon what I said; Nor was it at all My Opinion. On the Contrary, I thought there was a vast Difference betwixt the One and the Other.

This, as I remember, is the Substance of what then Pass’d between Him and Me on that Head: And what I have told, was then said by Me, I do still Maintain; according to what I have said on the foregoing *Prop. 4th.*

I Answer, 2ly, That as I did not, at that

Meet-

Meeting at *Edinburgh*, Deny the Formal Imputation of *Adams Sin* to his Posterity, or the *Reatus Peccati Adæ*; Nor Assert, that we only Suffer Misery by the Occasion of *Adams Sin*; So, neither have I uttered such Things any where else: For, they are contrary to My Fixed Opinion, and are Errors that I Yearly Refute. And seeing Mr. *Webster* Begs, I may not be Offended, when he Calls My Denying the Proper Imputation of *Adams Sin*, a Branch of Socinianism; To this Civil Demand I Answer, 1st, That I grant his Request, and take no Offence at all at this, more than at any other Part of his Libel: Only, I am at a Loss, where to Learn, that the Denying a Proper Imputation of *Adams Sin*, is a Branch of *Socinianism*; which seems to Imply, that they grant an Improper Imputation of it; whereas, by what I have read of their Writings, they Deny the Imputation of it altogether, without Distinction. But, I find, it is only Mr. *Webster's* Modest Way of Speaking, when he says, I deny the Proper Imputation of *Adams Sin*; For, he Explains it thus, in the End of the Paragraph; Yet the *Reatus Peccati Adæ*, advanced by Our Divines, is denied both by the Socinians and the Professor (m). I know, it is an Error Maintain'd by *Socinus* and his Followers, that the Guilt of *Adams First Sin* is not Imputed to his Posterity (which is Opposed in our Confess. Ch. 6. §. 3.); And I make all due Acknowledgements to Mr. *Webster* for Ranking Me among so Good Company; And only Crave, that he may be so Good, as, either to Prove this Part of his Charge; Or else Submit to the Censure due to

M 3

Me,

Me, if Convict of it; as he Promised Solemnly before the Late *General Assembly* of 1714. 2ly. Instead of being Offended, I pity him, when Reduc'd to this sorry Shift, for the Proof of his General Accusation, given in against Me at *Edinburgh*, before the Reverend Synod of *Lothian and Tweeddale*, Where he Undertook to Prove me Guilty both of Socinian and Arminian Errors; That, first, He is Obliged to Advance an Article in his *Libel*, which is *Notoriously False*; and then, to Call That a *Branch of Socinianism*, or a Socinian Error, which is Common to them, with several Others, who Reject and Abhor these Errors of Theirs, which are *Peculiar to that Sect*. However herein he Observed the Old Rule, *Calumniare Audacter*.

I Answer 3ly. Mr. *Webster* does also very much Injure Me, in Alledging, I Owned No Imputation of *Adams First Sin*, but only, that his Posterity fall into Trouble, or suffer Loss by Occasion of it, in such Way, as a Parent, that has the whole of his Maintenance from his Son, may Suffer, when his Son, for a Capital Crime is Deprived of Life and Estate; In which Case the Parents Loss is purely Accidental; and neither the Law-giver, nor Law, had any Particular Regard to such a Father, or any Body else, that might Depend on the Criminal Son for the Support of his Life: And had the Son lost his Estate by Robbery, the Calamities of War, or Prodigality, or any other Providential Way, suppose by Persecution for the Cause of Christ; the Father had sustained the same Loss, without the Imputation of any Sin to him or his Son; Whereas,

in

in the Case of *Adam*, all the Evils that befell Him and his Posterity, are Inflicted according to the Sanction of the Righteous Law of GOD, which Reached both Him and Them, for his first Breach of it ; None of which Evils could have befallen Him or Them any other way, at least, supposing, this Law was once given them : Which I think, is a Plain and Easy Answer to this *Arminian* Objection, Mr *Webster* here makes Use of, and to others of the like Nature Proposed by the Men of that Party.

The Imputation also of *Adams* First Sin to His Posterity may, I think, be easily Proved against all the *Arminians*, who Deny it, much more against *Placæus* ; From the Evils they themselves Grant to be the Native Fruits and Consequences of *Adams* First Sin, and of the Punishment Inflicted on *Adam* for it ; Considering that all these Evils flow from the Sanction of the Law of GOD, who Knew Perfectly what would be the Consequences of Threatning and Inflicting such a Punishment, and what Misery it would bring upon *Adam* and his Posterity ; And therefore, GOD must be Supposed to have Denounced it as a Designed Punishment both of Him and Them ; Unless we can Imagine, that any of these Miseries could Follow thereupon, without His Knowledge, or Beside, or Contrary to His Design.

Now, All These Propositions I Disown, and Yearly Refute ; and Crave that Mr. *Webster* may be Obligated to Prove Them, or, be Duely Censured for His False and Calumnious Accusation.

Here I might Reasonably End this *Article*: But I am Willing to let the Presbytery, and Church of Scotland Know, what I Teach on This Head.

1st, I Think Dr. *Owens* Definition of the Imputation of Sin, very Good. *Wherefore, To Impute Sin, is, To Lay it unto the Charge of any, and to Deal with them according to its Desert*, See his Book on *Justification*, Chap. 7 Page 234. Or which is much the same, To Impute Sin to a Person, is, To Charge him with Guilt, or, as Liable to Punishment, according to the Sanction of a Law for Sin Committed by Himself or Another, against the Preceptive Part of it. And so, to Impute *Adams* Sin to his Posterity, is, to Charge them with the Guilt of it, and to Adjudge them as Liable to Punishment for it, according to the Sanction of the Law of Works. Which is the Obvious Sense of Our *Confession*, Ch. 6. §. 3. Or, It is, to Lay his Sin to their Charge, and deal with them according to its Desert, as the Sanction of the Law appoints. Which Two Ways of Speaking, in My Opinion, signify the same thing: For, it is *Adams* Sin *it self*, and not any thing else, for which we are Guilty and Subjected unto Punishment; And it is *Adams* Sin that is laid to Our Charge, for which GOD Deals with us according to its Desert, as He had Threatned.

2ly. I Think all Imputation of Sin by GOD, *Proper, Formal, and Just*; Being Persuaded, that He alwise Imputes Sin according to the Righteous Sanction of His Law, whether He Impute it to these who Personally Transgress, or Others. And, I Think it a Reflection on the Wisdom and Justice

But of GOD, to Imagine, that He Imputes Sin any Other Way than Properly; Or, that any Afflictive Evil can Follow from the Sanction of His Law, Accidentally, or Beside His Design, as I said above. And this Agrees exactly with what the Apostle says, *Rom. 5. 12, -----19.* For, as I Noticed before, in *v. 13.* he Expressly Founds the Imputation upon a Law, and not upon a Covenant. Now, by this Method, the Imputation of *Adams* First Sin to all his Posterity, clearly Follows from the Account of the Law or Covenant of Works Delivered in Scripture, and Summ'd up in Our Confession of Faith and Catechisms, and from Mr. *Websters* Own Account of it, wherein, as I said, He and I Agree, and Differ only about the Name. It is also Easy, this Way to Answer the Great Difficulty that Obviously Arises from it; Namely, How it is Agreeable to the Justice and Goodness of GOD, to Add such a Sanction to His Law that Threatens such a Punishment, which, if upon *Adams* First Sin should be Inflicted, would necessarily Involve, not only *Adam*, who Personally Sinned, but likewise all his Posterity in Sin and Misery. For, we may Reasonably say, that it being Evident from Scripture and Experience, that GOD hath done so, it must needs be Agreeable to His Infinite Justice, Goodness, and Wisdom, in the Exercise of His Sovereign Dominion, altho' we Cannot Fathom the Depths of his Counsels, or Explain the Manner how it is Agreeable to Them. And this even the Adversaries of Imputation do Grant. Yet the same Answer cannot be Given to such Difficulties as Press any Human Hypothesis; Because in that Case it is not Manifest, that GOD hath Done

Done what is Supposed: And Men are Ready to Suppose, that GOD hath Done, or may Do Things, which are really Inconsistent with His Justice, Goodness, and Other Perfections.

I Might also here take Notice, that the Notion of a Proper Covenant, wherein *Adam* by his Promise Undertakes for Himself and his Posterity, Contributes Nothing at all, to Remove Difficulties, brought against the Justice of GOD, in Imputing *Adams* Sin to them; On the contrary, it rather gives Occasion to New Difficulties: For, by his being their Natural Parent He had no Right to Engage in their Name, and so could not Oblige them. Wherefore, the Favourers of this Opinion are forced to suppose, that by some Divine Constitution he was Appointed to Act and Transact in their Name: But, there is no such Clause in the Law of Creation given to *Adam*, or in the Covenant of Works, as above Explained by Mr. *Webster* himself. And truly, such a Constitution should have been Prior to the Covenant made with *Adam*, and Distinct from it: But, such a Constitution I have not as yet seen Proved from Scripture.

Moreover, when such a Constitution is Supposed, the Supposing also, that GOD made a Proper Covenant with *Adam*, is wholly Needless: For, if, by that Constitution, all *Adams* Management, whether Good or Bad, was equally in his Own, and his Posterities Name, it is all one thing, whether he Transgressed a Law, or Brake a Covenant.

But Finally, the Supposition of such a Constitution is Attended with this Considerable Difficulty, that

Adam

Adam
a Tuto
eous S
Knew,
manag
ice an
of suc
putabl
Contr
by the
able
to R
would
Magi
time,
To
ers c
but,
Whic
they
Conf
Met
fessio
ties
M
ly I
Sin
Sub
Par
bein
tati
Ad
and
be

Adam had thereby been placed in the Relation of a Tutor *Dative* to his Posterity, by God the Righteous Sovereign over Him and Them, who both Knew, and also Designed that *Adam* should Mismanage. Now, according to all the Rules of Justice and Equity known among Men, the Faults of such a Representative are so far from being Imputable to the Pupils Represented, that, on the Contrary, whatever Loss or Damage they Sustain by their Tutors Mismanagement, would be Imputable to their Tutor, and he would be Obligated to Repair it, and in case of his Inability, they would have a Right to Seek Redress from the Magistrat who Appointed him, and Knew, at the time, that he would certainly Mismanage.

To which, and the like Objections the Favourers of this Hypothesis can give no other Answer, but, that GOD may do so in his Sovereignty; Which they have no Sufficient Warrant for, until they first Prove, that GOD has Made such a Constitution. But, if we take the plain Scripture Method, above Explain'd, Summ'd up in Our *Confession* and *Catechisms*, these and the like Difficulties are Evited.

Mr. *Webster* may also, from what is said, easily Perceive the Reason, why only *Adams* First Sin is Imputed to all his Posterity, but not his Subsequent Sins, nor all the Sins of Intermediate Parents; Namely, that the Sanction of the Law being the Foundation and Measure of the Imputation of Sin, unless it Determine, that not only *Adams* First Sin, but also all his Subsequent Sins, and the Sins of Intermediate Parents, are alike to be Imputed to their Off-spring, there is no shadow

dow of Reason to Assert any such Thing. But there is nothing in the Law of GOD, or in the Works of His Providence, that gives any Ground for such a Thought. Besides, altho' such an Imputation had been Comprehended in the Law of Works, it might have been taken off by the Interposition of the Covenant of Grace.

From the whole, I Conclude, that what I do truly Hold and Teach, about the Covenant of Works, and *Adams* being a Publick Person Representing his Posterity, and the Imputation of his First Sin to them, is Exactly Agreeable to Scripture, and to Our *Confession of Faith* and *Catechisms*; And therefore, Nothing in it Censurable by this Church.

Answer to *Libel*, Class I. Article VII. & Class II. Article I. XI.

IN this Article Mr. *Webster* Charges Me with Error on these Two Accounts: 1st, Because I am not Satisfied with an Answer given by Professor *Marck* to an Argument Adduc'd by the *Pelagians* and Modern *Universalists*, to Prove the Necessity of Gods Giving Sufficient Grace to All Men. 2^{dly}, Because I give Another Answer, which Mr. *Webster* Thinks Wrong.

As to the Former, The First Fault Charged on Me, in his Representation Part 1st. (a) is, That I am not Satisfied with the Common Answer that Protestant Divines Give to the Objections of *Pelagians* and Others.

To which I Answer, That sometimes I am Satisfied with them, and sometimes not; And think

no Fault, that I am not Satisfied with them, when I do not find them Good. Some of *Augustins* Answers to the Objections of the *Pelagians* are Rejected by most Protestants, and Chiefly by These who are the most Opposite to the Errors of *Pelagius*: e. gr. His saying, *That All Infants who Die without Baptism are Damned*. If either a Minister or Professor in a Protestant Church be not at Liberty, to say, he is not Satisf'd with an Answer given even by the most Eminent Divines, to an Argument which may be Propos'd by the Worst of Hereticks, without Incurring the Guilt of Error and Censure for it, we must be in a State of Greater Bondage, than even Those of the Church of Rome. And, I would fain have Mr. Webster Consider, whether this be not to Introduce by the Back-Gate a Dangerous Branch of Popery, and that with Advantage, and to Proceed upon a Worse Principle, than is the Jesuits Doctrine of Probable Opinions.

The Second Thing, he Charges as a Crime, is, The Reason, he says, I give for My not being Satisf'd with Professor Marcks Answer, viz. *That I say, the Answer is False*.

To which I Answer, 1st. That Mr. Webster should have Specifi'd Professor Marcks Answer, by Citing the Words and Page of the Book, which here, as also through his Whole Libel, he Omits; and so Leaves both the Presbytery and Me in the Dark, as to the Meaning of the Article. However, as I have done formerly, so now I shall Cite the Passage of Professor Marcks *Medulla Theol. Christ.* to which this Article Relates; viz. Cap. 23. *De Vocatione Efficaci*. § 7. in fine. Obj. 3. pag. 321. The Words are, "*Alias Deum non posse*

posse mandare Fidem, aut Redarguere Incredulitatem. Resp. *Posse omnino propter Vires, quas in Adam habuimus, et propria Culpa perdidimus.* This is the Answer with which I Own I am not Satisfi'd.

2dly. The Reason of my not being Satisfi'd as Express'd in his *Libel*, runs thus: 'It might be well said to *Adam* that had Lost Power to Obey, but that can't be said of us who never had that Power; *Adam* Lost Power by his own Default, but we never Lost it by Our Fault (b.) Which Mr. *Webster* in his Representation, part i. (c) turns thus; 'We never had a Power of Obeying in *Adam*, and therefore never Lost it in *Adam*; And *Adams* Fault was not Our Fault. Which are Words of a quite Different Meaning from these in his *Libel*; And neither of them give a True and Distinct Account of My Opinion: And therefore, I must here take Notice of some Propositions with which He Falsly Charges Me.

PROP. I. *That we never had a Power in Adam of Obeying, (I suppose, he means, of Obeying GOD) and therefore never Lost it in Adam.*

PROP. II. *Adams Fault was not our Fault.* This, if taken in General, and without Distinction, That it is not Ours, either by Actual Commission, or by Imputation, I deny to be Mine; And, on the Contrary, Maintain, according to what I said on the Preceeding Article, that *Adams* Personal Fault, to the Commission whereof we had no Accession, may become our Fault by Imputation: I only Deny, that *Adams* Personal

Personal Fault can become Our Personal Fault, or
 Subjectively Ours. And if Mr. *Websters* Inform-
 ed, as he should have done, had told, *what it was*
that, I said, might be well said to Adam that had
lost Power to Obey, but cannot be said of us &c. it
 would have been Evident, that only in this Sense,
 I Deny *Adams* Fault to be Ours. The Words
 of which I speak so, are, *Propria Culpa perdidimus*,
 which, taken in their Proper Meaning, sig-
 nify Our Losing by Our Own Personal Fault, that
 is Subjectively Ours; Whereas, what we Lost in *A-*
dam, was Lost by His Personal Fault Imputed
 to Us. I Know, *Original Sin is Called Peccatum*
Commune et cujusque Proprium; But this is spoke
 of Inherent Corruption; And then Professor *Marcks*,
 Meaning would be, according to the true Sense
 of *Propria Culpa*, that we lost the Power we had in
Adam by the Original Corruption of Our Nature;
 which, I think, is a Sense he never Dream'd of, and
 would be a very ill Answer to the Objection:
 But, I am Persuaded, what he Means by *Pro-*
pria Culpa, is *Adams* First Sin, which is only
 Ours by Imputation, and can never become Our
 Personal Sin, or Our Fault Inherently or Subje-
 ctively; as Dr. *Owen* saith well in his Book on
Justification, P. 284, 285. Where, among other
 Things to the same Purpose, he saith, 'Sin as
 a Transgression of the Preceptive Part of the Law,
 cannot be Communicated from One to Another,
 unless it be by the Propagation of a Vitiated Ha-
 bit. But yet, neither so will the Personal Sin
 of One, as Inherent in Him, ever come to be the
 Personal Sin of Another. Which I think may be
 Evident to Every Body. Wherefore, I think,
 that

that what we Lost by Adams Sin Imputed to us, is very Unfitly Express'd by *Perdidimus Propria Culpa*; Which Words, according to their Genuine Use in the *Latin Tongue*, Signify, *We Lost by our own Personal Fault, that was Formally Ours and Subjectively in us.* And therefore, to Obviate the False Notion that these Words may give to any, who should Understand them in their Proper Sense, I say, *Perdidit Propria Culpa* might be well said of Adam, who by his own Personal Fault Lost his Power of Obeying GOD, but it cannot be said of Us, who did not Lose it by Our Own Personal Fault.

PROP. III. *When Adam Lost his Power to Obey, we Lost nothing, yea had nothing in Adam to Lose (d).* This Proposition is much the same with his First, only of Larger Extent; And nothing can be more Contrary to My Opinion than both these Propositions are: For I Hold and Teach, that Adam in Innocency, had a Power, Fully to Obey the Law of GOD given him, and to do that which was Good and Well-pleasing to GOD; and that by his Fall into a State of Sin, he wholly Lost all Ability of Will to any Spiritual Good accompanying Salvation; And moreover, became Averse from that Good, and Dead in Sin; And what Power of Obeying Adam Lost, we Lost in him: And besides this Power of Obeying, we Lost a great many other Excellent Perfections of Our Nature, and Happiness in Communion with GOD on Earth, and
Eternal

Eternal Glory with Him in Heaven. Whence it is Evident, that what is truly My Opinion, is so far from being Contrary to Our *Confess. Chap.* p. 2, 3. and the *Larg. Catech.* Concerning the Sinfulness and Misery of Our State by the Fall, that it is the very same with what is there Taught: And the Doctrine therein Contained I Yearly Teach.

Mr. *Webster* therefore may Reasonably Call this Scheme of his Own Framing, a *Dreadful Scheme*; and is but too Modest, when he says, *He will not Call it NAMES or 'NISMS (l)*, seeing he has an Unquestionable Right to Call the Child of his Own Imagination by what Names he Pleases.

I Crave, He may be Obligated to Prove these *Propositions*, from which, I do Grant, it would follow, that *Adam* was not the Representative of his Posterity, and that his Sin was not Imputed to them: But, the Premisses not being Mine, neither is the Conclusion: And in this I Use only such Plain Dealing, as becomes an Honest Man.

Before I Leave this, I must Answer Two Questions that Mr. *Webster* Asks Me (*m*). The former is, *If we had never that Power, and never lost it, whence is it that we have not that Power now?* To which I give the Reverend Mr. *Webster*, This Plain Answer, viz. *Because*, according to his Supposition, *We never had that Power*: But, being Persuaded, his Supposition is False, I Think, the true Reason, why we Want the

N

Power

Power of Obeying, Adam had, is, Because He and We in him, Lost it by his Fall.

The other Question, he Asks, is, Are we Obligated according to the Professors Scheme, to have a Power which in no State, and at no Time, we ever had, and for the Want of it be Condemned? To which I Answer, We are not.

As Mr. Webster in His Representation on the 7th Article Accuses Me for Denying, that we ever had a Power of Obeying in Adam, without Restriction, and that we had nothing to Lose in him, and lost nothing in him; So in his Representation, Part 2d (n), he Charges me particularly with saying, That Adam in the State of Innocence, had no Power of Believing in Christ: Which Last Proposition I have no Occasion to Mention in My Teaching, or to Move and Determine that Question on Either Side, which I have never done in My Teaching, so far as I Remember; Nor does Professor Marck in his *Medulla* Particularly Mention it: And tho' it may be Couched in his Answer to the foresaid Objection, yet I take no Particular Notice of it, it being Needless according to the Way I Answer it. Nor do I see any Use to Divinity by Determining such a Question.

But Mr. Webster having Asked Me this Question at *Edinburgh*, August. 13. 1713. I Condescended to Answer it together with all the rest he then Asked; Whereof this was the first.

Whether Adam in a State of Innocency, had a Power of Believing in Christ? If you Deny him that

that Power, I would know your Reason for it?

To which I gave this Answer, 'Adam in that State had a Power of Knowing, Believing and Doing whatever was Necessary unto, or Consistent with that State, that GOD should Reveal unto, or Require of him; Which he and his Posterity Lost by the Fall. But, *Believing* in Christ being Inconsistent with the State of Innocence, GOD could not Reveal it to him, nor Require it of him, and therefore he had no Power of Believing in Him.

Now, it is to be Noticed, that these Words; *A Power to Believe*, both in Mr. *Websters* Quest. and *Libel* are Ambiguous in Our Language; For they may be either Understood of Natural Ability and Actual Disposition of Soul, Sufficient for the Exercise of Saving Faith, without Supernatural Assistance; Or, for a Power of Exercising that Ability by Actual Faith in Christ: The former of these Meanings I Purposely waved in My Answer to him, because his Question was not direct and Distinct about it. But as to the Other Sense, I Answered, that *Adam* had no such Power, or could not Believe in Christ. And the Reason I gave for this Answer, manifestly Restricts it to this Sense. For, I say, Believing in Christ was Inconsistent with the State of Innocence, and therefore GOD could not Reveal it to him, nor Require it of him, in that State. Now, as Mr. *Webster* did not then Ask Me, whether *Adam* had a Sufficient Ability, and Disposition in Innocency for Believing in Christ; so, at that Conference, I neither Affirmed it, nor Denied it, as is Plain from My Answer, and I

do still Maintain the Truth of what I then said viz. That *Adam* could not Believe, or had no Power of Believing in Christ, or of Exercising Faith in Him; And therefore, if his Libel be Meant of the Natural Ability and Disposition that *Adam* had to Believe in Christ, while Innocent; I Answer, that I did not Deny *Adam* a Power of Believing, in that Sense; nor do I now Deny it: Yet altho' I had Denied it, I do not find, that Mr. *Webster* in his Representation does Prove it, to be Contrary to Our Confession or Catechisms.

For without Distinguishing the Sense of this Ambiguous Proposition, *ADAM in the State of Innocency had no Power of Believing in Christ*, he says 1st, 'This is Contrary to the Confess. Chap. 4. §. 2. which Asserteth our First Parents to have been Created with Knowledge, Righteousness, and true Holiness, after His own Image: Now this Holiness and Image, is the Concreated Uprightness Eccl. 7. 29. And which Includes a Power of Believing all that was Revelatum or Revelandum to Innocent *Adam* (o).

To which I Answer, I grant all this is true, as I did in my Answer to him at *Edinburgh*; But hence it will not follow, that *Adam* had a Power to Believe in Christ, until Mr. *Webster* Prove, that Believing in Christ was Revelatum or Revelandum to Innocent *Adam*; and so, for ought Mr. *Webster* says, even *Arminius*, who Denys both Senses of the Proposition, might maintain that his Opinion is not Contrary to this Passage of Our Confession.

Mr.

Mr. Webster says 2ly, 'That it is Contrary to Our Confess. Chap. 9. §. 2, 3. Where it is said, that Man in his State of Innocency had Freedom and Power to Will and to Do that which was Well-pleasing to GOD; And that Man by his Fall, has wholly lost all Ability of Will to any Spiritual Good. Whence (says he) I Conclude, he hath lost a Power of Believing in CHRIST, and therefore had that Power. (p)

I Answer, His Consequence is not Good: Yea Arminius might Deny it in both Senses of the Proposition, until Mr Webster Prove, that Believing in Christ was Revelatum or Revelandum to Innocent Adam; And also Prove, that a Sufficiency of Natural Qualifications for Believing in Christ, was by the Authors of our Confess. Included in the Power Adam had to Will and to Do that which was Good and Well pleasing to GOD; And consequently, that this Power was Included in the Ability of Will to any Spiritual Good, which he lost by the Fall: Seeing he lost Nothing by it, but what he had before, either in Possession or Promise.

3ly, Mr. Webster Adds this Reason of what he had said; For if he had it not, he Could never have lost it. I Answer, This is very True; but it does not prove, that Believing in Christ was Revelatum or Revelandum to Innocent Adam; on the Proof of which, the whole Stress of his Argument doeth ly.

Now, this I say not, that I am Concerned to Defend Arminius or his Opinion on this Head; being

N 3

Convinced

Convinced, that his Objection from this Topic hath no Force, but what it Receives from the ill Management of his Opponents: But, I do it, to shew the Weakness of Mr. *Webster's* Arguments, and how little Service is done to the Truth by them, or the like.

4ly, Mr. *Webster* Adds Another Reason, by way of Question; 'If he never had that Power, nor never Lost it, how can any Man be Punished for not Believing in CHRIST, tho' he cannot Believe? Yea, how can any Man be Obligated to Believe in CHRIST? For it is an Uncontested Axiom, that we are not Obligated to what was never in our Power, in any State whatsoever we have been placed (q).

To which I say, that I Know None more Concerned to Answer this Question, than Mr. *Webster*, and do Assure him, that he must seek for another Answer than *Adams* having this Power and Losing it, unless he can bring better Arguments, to Prove it, than he has done here; And till he Prove this, his Axiom will be of no Use to him.

5ly, Mr. *Webster* Proceeds to Confirm these his Weak Arguments from these Two Topicks; The One, the Authority of Good Men on His Side; The Other, from the Prejudice of Erroneous Heretical Persons being on Mine. (r)

As to the Former, he brings the Authority of the Learned and Holy *Rutherford* in his *Exam. Armin.* But, his Holiness and Learning did not Secure him from Mistakes in several weighty Points, and

from

from Using weak Arguments sometimes in his Dispute with the *Arminians*; and I think Mr. Webster will Own, that he Differs from some of his Opinions; and thinks some of his Arguments Weak: And I know no Reason, why I should not have the same Liberty; And according to our Protestant Principles, neither he nor I should take any thing upon Trust, even from Divines that are Esteemed most Eminent for Orthodoxy, Piety, and Learning; nor in any thing follow their Authority, except in so far, as, upon a fair Examination, we find, they followed CHRIST, and the Rule of Truth and Righteousness delivered by Him; And when we find, they keep not close by this Rule, we must leave Them.

As for Mr. *Rutherfords* Argument Cited by Mr. Webster, it is much the same with his Own; And the same Answer, in part, serves Both; And his Consequence is False, as to *Revelanda ex Hypothesi*: And I do not find, that Mr. *Rutherfords* Authority adds any Weight to it. He hath Six other Arguments in the Pages Cited by Mr. Webster to Prove, that *Adam* had a Power of Believing; And after Examination I cannot Find, that any One, or All of them together, are more Concludent than This mentioned by Mr. Webster. And I am Obligated to say the same of *Turretins* Performance on this Head: So, Finding their Arguments Nought, I cannot Follow their Authority. Only, I must here Notice, that Mr. *Rutherford* Declares himself of Another Opinion, in his Survey of *Antinomianism*, Ch. 8. p. 10. But the Law could not Accept Another Mans Imputed Righteousness; That is Supernatural; And

to Believe this, Required Grace and Strength of Higher Strain than Adam had.

As to Mr. Websters Other Topic, (o) That it is an Arminian Error, because Arminius Taught it. Resp. ad Art. 19. p. 128. Dico et Affirmo. Assevero, Prosteor, et Doceo, Adamum ante Lapsum non habuisse Potentiam Credendi in Christum, quia Fide in Christo non erat opus. Now, I say, this Connexion is False: For, altho' Adam did not then Need Faith in Christ, yet, it does not thence Follow, that he had not a Power of Believing. Wherefore, Arminius's following Inference is also False; viz. Ideoque Deum non potuisse ab illo Fidem illam exigere post Lapsum, hoc nimirum jure quia Adamus Potentiam illam sua Culpa amiserrat. And I find the Other Arguments of Arminius as Inconcludent as this. And truly, in my humble Opinion, Arminius has brought no sufficient Arguments, to Prove, that Adam had not a Power to Believe in Christ, before the Fall; And the Orthodox who Opposed him, have brought no Evident Proof, that Adam had such a Power, whether it be taken for the Natural Ability, or the Exercise of it; tho' the former Sense of it alone pertained to the Debate between them. All I add on this, is, If it be an Error Taught by Arminius, I am not Guilty of it, seeing I do not Teach it, and think the Arguments he adduces for it, to be Naught: Yet, I will not Grant, that a Proposition is Erroneous, because Arminius Taught it.

Mr. Webster Uses Another Argument, to Prove My Opinion to be an Arminian Error; Namely, Because it was Advanced by Arminius, to Support his

his Doctrine of Universal Grace, and to Assert, that All Mankind, even after the Fall, have a Power of Believing (p)

I Wish, Mr. Webster had Cited some Passage of Arminius's Works, where he Asserts, that All Mankind, even after the Fall, have a Power of Believing; and where he Supports this Assertion by saying, Adam had not a Power of Believing; For I have not been Able to find any such Thing in his Works, and am Persuaded, Mr. Webster cannot shew it.

Neither does *Episcopius*, Disp. 5. Thes. 6. Intimate any Thing like it. Nor can I find any such Thing in *Corvin. contra Tilenum, Defens. Armin. Grevinchovius contra Amesium*, pag. 183. has no such Thing; But, on the Contrary, on Supposition, that Adam had a Power of Believing, he says, Then he kept it, because, before the Fall, he could neither Use, nor Abuse it; and therefore, it could not be Taken away for his Abusing it. See his Own Words at the foot of the Page (q). As for *Arnold. contra Tilenum, Defens. Armin.* whom Mr. Webster Cites, as if a Different Author from the Others now Mentioned, I suppose, he is *Joan. Arnoldus Corvinus*, the very same whom before he called *Corvin*; whom he should have Cited by the forementioned

[p] page 43.

[q] 4. Adde, quod ex vestra Sententia, Adamo ablata sit Potentia ista, propterea quod ea ad Peccatum Abusus sit: At vero, si ante Lapsum ea ne Uti quidem potuit, certe nec Abuti. Eoque nec propter Abusum Auferri potuit, retinuit ergo post Lapsum Potentiam Credendi, et Reliqui etiam Reprobi in illo.

ed Name, seeing he Adduces his Words, and should also have Marked the Page where they may be found; for, as they stand in his Paper I can make no Sense of them. I shall therefore set them Down as Cited by Mr. *Webster* thus (s) *Arnold. contra Tilen. Defens. Armin. says, Licet Adamus Dona Gratiae sua ita amisit, Fidei Potentiam tamen in Christo Retinuit.* Which Word *Retinuit* Supposeth that Adam had a Power of Believing, and that, when he Lost his Other Gifts, he Kept This; Whereas it is Manifest, from the Writings of *Arminius* and *Corvin*, that they constantly Maintain, that Adam never had such a Power, and therefore could not Lose it; Whence they conclude, *VWhen God Commanded Men to Believe in Christ, it was Necessary, He should either Give them a Power to Believe in Him, or be Ready to Give it Them*: So that, if *Corvin* said any such Thing, he would Contradict both Himself and *Arminius*. I do therefore Challenge Mr. *Webster* to shew this Passage in the Writings of *Arnoldus Corvinus contra Tilenum*, or of any Other *Arnold. contra Tilenum*. I do Find in *Corvin contra Tilenum* this Passage, *Sed licet Dona sua Gratiae ita amisit, Fidei tamen in Christum Potentiam non amisisse vidimus.* Cap. 14. p. 520. Which Words Agree very well with the fore-mentioned Opinion of *Arminius* and *Corvin*, but do not at all Prove Mr. *Websters* Proposition, namely, *That the Denying, Innocent Adam had a Power of Believing in Christ, was advanced by Arminius, to Support this Assertion, That all Mankind, even after the Fall, have a Power of Believing*; And therefore, Mr. *Webster* found it

• Needful

Needful to Strike out these Words, *Non Amisſe vidimus*, and in their Room to Insert *Retinuit*; Which makes this Paſſage Contradictory to all that Corvin has been Pleading for, in his Preceding Diſcourſe.

This Unfair Citing of Corvins Words discovers the true Reason, why his Name is Changed, and the Page Omitted in this Citation. But Mr. Webſters Gloſs on this Citation is very Odd; His Words are, *This is a good Conſequence, if Adam in Innocence had no Power of Believing in Chriſt, All Mankind have a Power of Believing in Him; becauſe we had not loſt it in Adam (t).* This appeared to me ſo bad a Conſequence at firſt View, that I perſuaded my ſelf, it was an Error of the Tranſcriber, until I Compared it with the Original Copy, and with his Learned Queſtion Propoſed in the Representation, Part I. on this Article (u) Namely, *If we had never that Power, and never loſt it, whence is it, we have not that Power now?* And found this Conſequence Repeated in the End of the Next Paragraph, ſave one, where, *Upon Suppoſition, that Adam had no Power of Believing in Chriſt, Repenting, &c.* he ſays, *It neceſſarily Inſers All his Poſterity to have a Power of Repenting and Suffering Patiently, &c. becauſe we loſt none of that Power in Adam (x)*

Now, If the Arminians can by no better Conſequences than theſe, Support their Doctrine of *Universal Grace*, and Prove, that All Men, after the Fall, have a Power of Believing in Chriſt, from Adams having had no ſuch Power; I can ſee

see no Harm to the Truth, suppose I should, with *Arminius*, Deny, that *Adam* in Innocence had a Natural Ability, Sufficient for Believing in Christ; which yet I am far from Doing. And, I humbly conceive, that a Person who thinks this a Good Consequence, Needs not think any Consequence Bad, that is Contain'd in the Writings of *Arminians*, *Pelagians* &c. For it is rather Worse than the Boys Common Sophism, *Quod non perdidisti habes*, &c. If this Consequence would hold Good in Worldly Things, Mr. *Webster* might get Employment, and make Gain of this New Invention, and might begin with himself. If Mr. *Websters* Father never had an Estate of 10000 lib. a year, Mr. *Webster* hath an Estate of 10000 lib. a year, because he never lost it in his Father; and to Secure the Consequence, it may be added, *Neither did he lose it himself*.

I shall pass the Arguments Mr. *Webster* adduces in the Two following Paragraphs, to prove that *Adam* had a Power of Believing, because there is not an Appearance of Force in them. I only Notice, that he Alledges, *Adam* had a Power of Mortifying Indwelling Sin, which it is Impossible he could have; and so, instead of Proving this Point against the *Arminians*, he affords them a Good Argument against it.

In the Three Last Paragraphs of his *Representation* he brings an Argument against my Opinion, and attempts to Prove, that *Adam* might have Exercised the Power of Believing in Christ, in the State of Innocence: Which Proof if I found Evident, I should willingly yield this Point to him.

He says, 1st, 'GOD might have Told Innocent Adam, that he was not to Obtain Life by the Covenant of Works, but that he would Involve himself and his Posterity, in Condemnation, by his Sinning; but yet that Free Grace had Provided CHRIST to be a Saviour (y).

Now, this, I say, GOD Could not have Told Adam, because it was Inconsistent with His Own Wisdom and Holiness, and with Adams State: For, it is a Plain Contradiction to the Sanction of the Law, *In the Day thou Eatest thereof, thou shalt surely Die*: Yea, it more effectually takes off the Force of the Threatning, than the Serpents Words, *Ye shall not surely Die*. It is also Plain, that it was Necessary for Adam and Eve's Standing, that they should firmly Believe the Threatning to be Certain and Peremptory; Seeing they were so easily drawn to Transgress the Command, as soon as their Faith about it was shaken. And if we may Judge of Adams Power and Capacity, for Receiving such a Revelation from GOD, as Mr. Webster mentions, by the Strength of Natural Ability, which Adam and Eve Discovered, when Affaulted with Satan's Temptation, that in part Contain'd what, Mr. Webster supposes, GOD might have Told them, but had nothing of the most Sublime and Mysterious Part of it; It will, at least, appear Probable, that Adam then had no Sufficiency of Strength and Ability for Receiving such a Revelation, and therefore Needed from GOD a Greater Degree of Power and Capacity before he Revealed this to him.

Mr.

Mr. *Webster* says, 2ly. ' Upon this Suppo-
 ' fition Innocent *Adam* would have been Obliged
 ' to have Cordially Acquiesced in this New
 ' Way of Coming at Happiness; This being fo
 ' Clear a Revelation of GODs Will, for the
 ' Brightest Manifestation of His Attributes (z)

To which I Answer, 1st, That the Suppo-
 fition is Impossible. 2ly, Granting, it were not
 Impossible, it might be first Necessary, that
 GOD should Give *Adam* a Greater Degree of
 Power, than was Given him at his Creation, to
 Render him Capable of such a Revelation; And
 so, it Proves Nothing even against *Arminius*. 3ly,
 Upon this Supposition it may be Questioned, 1,
 Whether the Devil would not have spoken Truth
 to *Eve*? 2, Whether Our First Parents had
 Sinned in their Eating the Forbidden Fruit;
 Or rather, Whether they had not been Obliged
 to do it, after So Clear a Manifestation of GODs
 Will, for the Brightest Manifestation of His At-
 tributes?

Mr. *Webster* says 3ly, ' If he was Obliged
 ' thus to Acquiesce in the Contrivance of Sal-
 ' vation by Christ, then he had a Power to it (a).

To which I Answer, If Mr. *Webster* shall
 Prove, that *Adam* was actually Obliged, before
 the Fall, to Acquiesce in the Contrivance of
 Salvation by Christ, I shall Grant, he had then
 a Power to do it, which was either Concreated
 or Superadded by GOD, and so Admit his fol-
 lowing Axiom: But, until he Prove this Actual
 Obligation, it cannot be justly Inferred from his

Premises,

Premises, that *Adam* had such a Power any Way; For all is as yet Pure Supposition, and that Chimerical enough. If this Way of Arguing were Just, the Greatest Absurdities might be Proved by it. But, Supposing such a Revelation of Christ, and an Acquiescence, such as Innocent *Adam* was Capable of; Yet it will not thence Follow, that *Adam* could Exercise Justifying Faith in Christ, as Mr. *Webster* Alledges, in these Words, ' And the Cordial Acquiescence in the Way of Salvation by Christ, is a most Essential Act of Faith in Christ, even of that Faith that Justifies: So Dr *Owen* on *Justification* saith, and Others (*b*).

To which I Answer, that Mr. *Webster* either has not Read, or has not well Understood what Dr *Owen* saith about Justifying Faith, in his Book on *Justification*; And also, that he seems to have very Unsound Notions of Justifying Faith, Contrary to the Excellent Description of it in Our *Larger Catechism*, in these Words: ' Justifying Faith is a Saving Grace, wrought in the Heart of a Sinner by the Spirit and Word of GOD, whereby he, being Convinced of his Sin and Misery, and of the Disability in himself and all other Creatures, to Recover him out of his Lost Condition, not only Assenteth to the Truth of the Promise of the Gospel, but Receiveth and Resteth upon Christ and His Righteousness therein held forth, for Pardon of Sin, and for the Accepting and Accounting of his Person Righteous in the Sight of GOD for Salvation.

To

(*b*) P. 45.

To this Description Agrees Well what Dr. Owen Teaches about Justifying Faith, in his forefaid Book, Chap. 1, page 97. where Mr. Webster may find him Afferting, *That Conviction of Sin is a Necessary Antecedent to Justifying Faith*: Which he proves at Large. Now, Innocent Adam being Uncapable of this, could not Exercise Justifying Faith, according to the Doctor. 2ly, He faith, *That the whole Nature of Justifying Faith doth not Consist meerly in the Assent of the Mind, be it never so Firm and Stedfast*, page 108. Which he Proves by several Arguments: Arg. 5th, he says, 'It is no more than what the Devils themselves may have. Arg. 6th. It no way answers the Descriptions of Justifying Faith that are given in the Scriptures; particularly it is by Faith, as it is Justifying, that we are said to Receive Christ, to Receive the Promise, the Word, the Grace of GOD, the Atonement.

Now, these Acts cannot possibly be Included in any Acquiescence in the Way of Salvation, that Innocent Adam was Capable of; For, on Supposition, it had been Revealed to him, all the Faith he could have had was, to Assent to the Truth of its being a Good Way of Saving Sinners; which Faith the Angels might have; and Adam could only have had this more than they, that he Believed, it would be Good for him to Follow this Way of Salvation, when ever he should happen to Sin, and might Resolve, in that Event, to make Use of it. Now, tho' such an Assent and Persuasion be Essential to Justifying Faith, yet it wants another Essential Part, which is necessary, to Distinguish Justifying Faith from the Faith that is

not

not Justifying; Even as a Creature that hath only the Power of Sensation, wants the most Essential Part whereby a Man is Distinguish'd from Beasts.

Dr. Owens 8th Argument is, 'That Faith alone is Justifying, which hath Justification actually accompanying of it, for thence alone it hath that Denomination. To suppose a Man to have Justifying Faith, and not to be Justified, is to suppose a Contradiction. p. 110, 111. Now, if this be True, and also Mr. Websters Supposition, then Innocent Adam might have been Actually Justified, and Pardoned, for Eating the Forbidden Fruit, before he Committed that Sin; Which was a far better Security against Danger from it, than a *Papish Indulgence*. Moreover, this Act of Faith Exercised by Innocent Adam, while yet he Represented All his Posterity, must Needs have been Imputed to them All, as well as his Sin; And so, they should have Obtained Pardon of it in and with Him; Unless we can suppose, the Federal Relation was that of a *Societas Leonina*. Whence every Body may see the relative Tendency of this Part of Mr. Websters Divinity, and how ill he understands what Dr. Owen means by *Acquiescence*; Which I might have shewn by many other Passages of that same Chapter: And, I hope, the Presbytery, and other Jurisconsults of this Church, will take Notice of the Motion Mr. Webster hath here given of a most Essential Act of that Faith in Christ that Justifieth; which, I humbly Conceive, he will not be Able to Reconcile with the foresaid Description of Justifying Faith in Our *Larger Catechism*, unless

O

he

he Acknowledge, that the Faith in Christ, which upon his Own Supposition, Innocent Adam was Capable of Exercising, *must needs want a Most Essential Act of that Faith which Justifieth*; Which Defect will Evidently Destroy his whole Argument, altho' what he Supposeth were Granted him; seeing it is Justifying Faith that the Gospel Requires, and Admits nothing less. I must therefore Own, that he has Adduced nothing, to Convince Me, or any Other Man of Tolerable Skill in Philosophy and Divinity, that either Adam Had a Power or Ability of Believing in Christ, or that he could have Exercis'd it.

From the whole View of Mr. *Websters* Arguments, I think, I have made it Evident, that I have too Good Reason for Disliking the foregoing Answer to the *Pelagian* Objection; were it on no other Account, but that it Involves Us in a New and Endless Dispute with the *Pelagians* and *Arminians*, which, if Manag'd no Better than Mr. *Webster* has Done, gives them Ground of Triumph. And truly, I must Own, that I have not as yet found any of Our Divines Acquaint themselves in this Dispute to the Conviction of Our Adversaries, with such Force and Evidence as I could have Wish'd. For this Reason, therefore, were there no other, I Think it my Duty to Look for, and Give Another Answer to it. And I am the more Moved hereunto by another Objection of Our Adversaries, which they Urge against the foregoing Answer; Namely, Supposing Adam Had a Power of Believing in Christ, and by his Own Fault Lost it to Himself and Us, and that for His Sin both He and We Deserv

Eterna

Eternal Wrath, and that God might Justly Leave Us under Condemnation, without Hope of Pardon; Granting, all these Things were True, they say, Yet if God Declare, that He will Extend Mercy and Clemency to them, and Promise Pardon under a Condition, Justice Requires, that it be either what they can Perform in their Own Strength, or that GOD give, or be Ready to give Strength: And, they Alledge, that to Offer Mercy, and in the mean time to require under a New Penalty what is Impossible for them to Do, is contrary to the Nature of Clemency, and the Rules of Justice, even altho' they Lost their Power by their Former Sin, unless with the Command God give them Strength, or be Ready to Give it. This Objection is at great length Urged by *Corvinus, Defens. Armin. contra. Tilen.* p. 521, 522, 523. For Removing whereof, the foresaid Answer is not Sufficient. Therefore, that I may give no Occasion to the foresaid Litigious Debate, about *Adams* Power of Believing, and also take off the Force of this Objection, which Contains the Chief Thing they have to Say; I think it my Duty to give another Answer, which *Mr. Webster* is now Displeased with, and therefore makes it an *Article* of his Libel, in these Words (c). 'The Justice of God in Commanding us to Obey, appears Evidently, if we Consider, He has been Pleas'd to Reveal His Grace, and Offers Strength to Us by the Gospel, and Commands us to Ask, and we shall Receive; And we have Natural Powers and Abilities to seek

‘ the Lords Special and Saving Grace, which if
 ‘ we Do, He hath Promis’d to Give us His Spe-
 ‘ cial Saving Grace, *Matth. 7. 7.* God may
 ‘ Sovereignly Prevent Sinners, when they are not
 ‘ Seeking Him; But His Ordinary Way of Com-
 ‘ municating His Grace, is in the Way of their
 ‘ Seeking after it.

To which I Answer, Mr. *Websters* Informer
 has given him a very Indistinct Account of My
 Answer. What I say, is, in short, this,

That God doth Justly Command us in the
 Gospel to Believe in Christ, under a Special Pe-
 nalty.

I. Because, as in the same Gospel, upon the
 One hand, He tells Us, We cannot Believe of
 Our selves, unless it be Given us of God, as *Eph.*
 2. 8. *Phil. 1. 29.* *Act. 11. 18.* Where we
 are Taught, *that Faith and Repentance are Gods*
Gift; So, on the Other hand, He makes an Offer
 of His Grace, to Enable us to Believe, which is
 of as Large an Extent as the Command to Believe.
 And all who are Commanded to Believe, are al-
 so Commanded to Seek of God, Grace to Believe.
 And He hath Promised to Give it to all who
 Seriously and Sincerely Desire and Seek it. *Rev.*
 22. 17. *And let him that is Athirst Come: And*
whosoever will, let him take the Water of Life
freely. Compared with *Isa. 55. 1.* *Joh. 7. 37.*
Jam. 1. 5.

But this Offer of Saving Grace to all the Hear-
 ers of the Gospel who Seek it, is most Clearly
 Taught by Our Saviour, *Matth. 7. 7.---11.*
 His Sermon on the Mount, where He was Preach-
 ing to a Great Multitude, not only consisting of

Jews,
of a g
from b
compa
scribe t
this F
Gospel
Now
LORD
and the
times,
ception
th. I
be Thi
by Our
Unques
Knock?
mise Si
He wil
may fu
iev'd t
as yet
Promise
ole of
ers, wh
he aske
f they
their C
which is
Ask Hi
Certain
ture.
But
Mea

Jews, but that appears to have been also made up of a good Number of *Gentiles*, from *Syria* and from beyond *Jordan*; as is plain from *Matth. 5. 1.* compar'd with *Chap. 4. 24, 25.* which *verses* Describe the Multitudes to whom Our Lord Preached this Famous Sermon, that Contains a Sum of the Gospel.

Now, in the mentioned *verses* of *Chap. 7.* Our LORD Repeats the Command to Ask, Three times, and the Promise annex'd thereto He Repeats Six times, and Extends it to Every one, without Exception, v. 8. *For Every one that Asketh, Receiveth.* If the Dream was Doubled to Pharaoh, because the Thing was Certain; When the Command is here by Our LORD told over Thrice, must it not be Unquestionably the Duty of all to Ask, Seek, and Knock? And, when Our LORD Repeats the Promise Six times, must it not be as Certain, that He will not Fail to Accomplish it? Unless we may suppose, His Commands are Better to be Believ'd than His Promises. But Our LORD gives us yet further Assurance of the Certainty of the Promise to all that Ask, by Proposing the Example of any Parent in the Multitude of his Hearers, *who would not give to his Son a Stone, when he asked Bread, &c.* From whence he Concludes, *And if they being Evil knew how to give Good Gifts to their Children, how much more would their Father which is in Heaven give Good Gifts to them that Ask Him.* Whereby He Confirms the Truth and Certainty of this Promise from the Light of Nature.

But it is Question'd by some, I st, Whether this be Meant of Asking the First Supernatural Grace?

To which I Answer, that Our LORD is here Preaching to a Great Multitude, gathered out of several Countries, most of whom, we may, without Breach of Charity, say, wanted Saving Grace: And without all Question, Saving Grace is a Good Gift; And these things, which Our LORD would have them Ask, and Promises, their Father which is in Heaven would Give, He Calls Good Things, or Good Gifts, ἀγαθὰ ἢ δόματα, which Word is expressed in the former clause of the *verse*; So that it is Comprehended in Our LORDs General Expression. And that it is Chiefly Meant, is plain from the Parallel Place, *Luke* 11. 9---13. where we have the same Command and Promises Repeated, and Confirmed by the same Argument from the Light of Nature; And *v.* 13. in stead of *Good Things*, mention'd *Matth.* 7. Our LORD says, *How much more shall the Heavenly Father Give the Holy Spirit to them that Ask Him.*

It is Question'd, 2ly, Whether the Command and Promise be Directed to any except Believers? To which I Answer, It can scarce be Doubted, that there were Many Unconverted Persons among that Multitude, to which Our LORD was then Preaching, to whom He Speaks without Distinction, and Directs the Promise, *Matth.* 7. 8. to *Every one that Asketh*. And there is no Ground to Suspect, it is Restricted to Believers, from Our LORDs saying, *Your Heavenly Father*; For, it is well known, that all the *Jews* Called GOD *their Father*, *Joh.* 8. 41. And so all the Heathen Called their *Supreme God* their *Father*: And GOD Called Himself the *GOD of the Jews*, and Owns Himself *their Father*, when in a very Corrupt and Degenerate

Degenerate State. He is also Called *the GOD of the Spirits of all Flesh*, and *the Father of Spirits*. No Wonder, then, that Our LORD Called GOD *the Father* of all his Hearers, seeing He was not only the Father of them all, as Creator and Governour of the World, but especially because He was now Offering them His Richest Grace and Fatherly Kindness, Exhorting them to Seek, and Promising, that, upon Asking, -they should Receive Good Things from Him, and Find, that He was a more Loving and Bountiful Father, than any* Father among them was to his Children. Luke hath it thus, *ὁ πατὴρ ὁ ἐξ ὀρανῶν*. So that, unless Our LORDs Words be Wrested, I cannot see, that this Command and Promise is Confined to Believers: On the Contrary, from the genuine Meaning of the Words, and from the Context, I think it Evident, that they are Directed Chiefly to the Unconverted, tho' not to them Only; and that the *Good Things* and *Spirit* Promised, are meant Chiefly, tho' not Only, of the *First Grace*, and other Spiritual Blessings relating thereunto.

This, therefore, I take to be a Plain and Necessary Part of the Gospel, which Our LORD Preached to a Mixed Multitude, whose Example Obliges all His Ministers, who would be found Faithful, to Preach it to their Hearers; as I have heard Many of them Do; And as *Hoornbeek* does, *Theol. Pract. Lib. 1. Cap. 1. Pag. 17.* 'Postremo, 'nemo qui vere Salutem curat, & quærit, frustra 'hoc facit unquam; sed quod quærit, invenit. Which he Proves from *Matth. 7. 7, 8.* and adds, 'Propterea hoc singulis faciendum est, quia *omnis* quæ-

'rens invenit hoc quod apud Deum quærit, ne
'frustra vel quærere, vel ad hoc instigari videamur.
'Prov. 8. 17. *Studiose quærentes me, inveniunt me.*

II. There are Means Appointed of GOD, for Obtaining this Grace, to be Used by those who as yet want it; Such as Reading, and Hearing the Word of GOD with Attention, Meditating upon it, and especially Prayer to GOD for Renewing and Converting Grace; Which Means, when Diligently Used with Seriousness and Sincerity, and Faith of being Heard, in Opposition to Sloth, Hypocrisy, Deceit, and Formality, GOD hath Promised to Bless with Success; as is Evident from what is said above; To which may be added *Psal. 145. 18.* and many other Texts.

III. The Going about these Means, in the Manner just now Described, is not above the Reach of Our Natural Ability and Powers, were they rightly Applied and Exercised. This is also Presupposed to what Our Lord Teaches, as above Explain'd; and is Evident from the Prescription of Means for Obtaining the First Grace, to those who want it. For, it seems very Unaccountable, to say, that People should Use Means, for Obtaining the First Grace, which yet they cannot Use until they have got it, because it is above their Natural Ability to make Use of them; Which is, in Effect, as much as to say, there are no Means appointed of GOD, with a Promise of Success, that People can Use, for Obtaining Renewing Grace, until they first be Renewed, or for Obtaining the First Supernatural Grace, until once they have Got it. And, if there be no Promise of Success to the Use of Means before Re-
generation,

generation, no Person can go about them with so much as a Historical Faith of Success, until he know, that he is Regenerated.

IV. There are Means and Motives laid before Sinners by the Providence of GOD, and especially by His Word, which are excellently well fitted for Begetting in them Historical Faith, while they are Unconverted; and for Exciting in them a Serious Concern about their Salvation, and for Working on their Hopes and Fears, with Respect to a Future State of Happiness or Misery; and for Convincing them, that they are continually in Danger of falling into Hell, which is an Evil Infinitely Greater than all Worldly Calamities, and the most Cruel Death; And for persuading them, that the Joys of Heaven Infinitely exceed all Worldly Pleasures. There are also Arguments proper to Convince them of the Need of Divine Grace, to Renew their Natures, and Convert them to GOD in Christ, and bring them into a State of Favour and Friendship with Him. All which Means, and the like, if People in their Natural Estate would apply their Minds unto, and seriously Consider, they would be Moved with Fear, Concern and Care about their Eternal State; and be Convinced of the Need of Christ, and of His Grace to Convert and Save them; and would be Moved to Cry to GOD for it, as Seriously and Earnestly, as the Mariners in the Ship with *Jonah* Cryed to their God, to Save their Lives, or the People of *Nineveh* did, to Spare their City: Which if they should do, I think GOD would Grant them His Spirit, according to Our Lords Promise. And altho' there be in their asking

ing nothing of Merit, nor even so much as these Qualifications that are Required in the like Duties, when Performed by a Believer, yet they are Accepted and Blessed with the Success Promised through Jesus Christ, according to the Tenor of the Covenant of Redemption; which Way all other Duties must be Accepted that Preceed Justifying Faith.

V. Altho' it do not Exceed Mans Natural Powers to Use the foresaid Means; Yet, the Serious Application and Diligent Exercise of their Powers in the sincere Use of these Means, for Obtaining the Saving Grace of GOD in Christ, do not Depend upon, and flow from their Own Free Will, that is not Circumscrib'd or Determin'd in all its particular Actions, by the Eternal Decree of GOD, and His Particular Providence; which is the *Pelagian* and *Arminian* Error on this Head, according to which We would Choose GOD first, and not He Us; Or rather, not one of *Adams* Sinful Race would Regard or make Use of these Means, but would go on in a Course of Sin, until they Perished. This Error, therefore, I carefully Refute every Year.

And, on the Contrary, I Hold and Teach, that all these Means, Ordinary, and Extraordinary, by which any of GODs Elect are to be Converted (among which are these Means which preceed Regeneration, or the First Grace) are all specially Determined in the Covenant of Redemption, and Decree of Election: In which also the Several Uses of these Means, and their Connexion with Saving Grace and Glory, and likewise the Persons who are to Use them, and be Con-

verted

verted by such Particular Means, whether Ordinary, or Extraordinary, are particularly Specifi'd and Determin'd. All which Parts of the foresaid Covenant and Decree are Effectually and Infallibly brought to pass by the Particular, Powerful, and Gracious Providence of GOD.

Whence it Follows, 1st, That none but the Elect will ever Apply their Natural Powers to the Right Use of these Means Described; And so, None but they will Obtain Saving Grace: So that the First Thing which Distinguisheth the Elect from the Reprobate, here on Earth, is, That the Former Employ their Natural Powers in the right Use of these Means, for Obtaining the Grace of GOD in Christ, while the Other Reject and Slight them, or do not Use them Aright, as above Described.

It Follows, 2^{ly}, That no Person who Uses his Natural Faculties, in going about these Means aright, and who in the Use of them Obtains Saving Grace, hath any Thing to Ascribe to Himself, or the Good Management of his Own Free-will; But, on the Contrary, has GOD to Bless for Giving Him Counsel, and for the Steady Conduct of his Providence, whereby He was Guided and Excited to every Step, in the right Use of these Means, without which he had Slighted them, as others do. And above all, he hath Reason to Bless GOD, for the Rich Promise of His Free Grace, and His Faithful Accomplishment thereof, in Bestowing it Freely on him an Unworthy Sinner, in that Way which He had Appointed; And must Acknowledge, that *he has Nothing but what he hath Received,*
and

and that GOD Alone *hath made him to Differ.*

It Follows 3ly, That there is a Preparatory Work in the Souls of Sinners, which Preceeds Regeneration and Conversion, that, by the Eternal Purpose of GOD, and the Gospel Revelation, is Necessarily Connected with Regeneration and Conversion; Whereof there are Counterfeits in the Reprobate, and sometimes also in the Elect; as there are also Counterfeits of Saving Faith in them Both. But the Preparatory Work which is Genuine, is never to be Found, except in the Elect, and hath alwise Conversion following upon it, tho' later in some and sooner in others.

It Follows 4ly, That all the Rest of the World who Reject or Slight these Means, are Left utterly Inexcusable, because they do not what is within the Reach of their Natural Powers, which if they did, they should Obtain Saving Grace; And they have no better Excuse in this Case, than they would have for Rejecting or Slighting the Necessary Means of their Health and Life, or of Promoting the Good of their Families, which Providence lays to their Hand.

5ly, By this Method, Our Doctrine of Election and Reprobation; Of the Extent of GODs Eternal Decree, and Particular Providence to all Things that come to pass; And the Doctrine of Particular Grace, Design'd, Purchas'd for, and Bestow'd on the Elect alone, Remain Safe and Untouch'd: And all the *Pelagian* and *Arminian* Objections against Effectual Calling, and Our Doctrine Relating thereunto, such as,

the

the Outward Call to Repent and Believe the Gospel and the Offer of Grace made in common to the Elect and Reprobate, are, so far as I see, intirely cut off. And the *Pelagians* and *Armini-ans* have nothing to Object against this Part of Our Doctrine, but what they usually say against Our Doctrine of GODs Decreeing all Things Unchangeably; and His Bringing all Things to pass Effectually and Infallibly, by His Particular Providence

This Answer, therefore, taking wholly away, as I humbly think, all the Force of that *Pelagian* Objection, to which I Apply it, and also of many others Linked with it; And being very Agreeable to the Scriptures of Truth, and Our Lords Express Doctrine, and to the Sum of it Contain'd in Our *Confession of Faith* and *Catechisms*, I Choose to make Use of it in stead of the Answer given by Professor *Marck*, and think, I have very Good Right so to do. But, if Mr. *Webster* or any Body else, Like the Other Answer better, they may Choose it, for me: And if he, or any other shall give Me Convincing Arguments, that there is any Thing in this Answer of Mine, which is Contrary to Scripture Doctrine, or the Sum of it in Our *Confession* and *Catechisms*, I shall be very Ready to Receive them, and Correct My Mistake.

As to what Mr. *Webster* says, in the 2d Part of his *Representation*, Err. 10 (d) Relating to a Branch of this Article, viz. the Connexion betwixt the Use of Means, or Moral Seriousness, and

and Regenerating Grace; which, he says, ' *Rutherford* in his *Exam. Armin.* from P. 334 to 345, has Confuted at great Length, and with many Solid Arguments, in all its Shapes and Figures, in which it can be Dressed: I only Answer, that if Mr. *Webster* or any Other will be pleas'd to Compare what I have said above with what Mr. *Rutherford* there Refutes, they will easily perceive, that he has not Refuted it in the Shape wherein I have Dress'd it; Nor hath he one Argument, that in the least Weakens any Thing that I have said.

I must Notice, in the Last Place, the Last Words of his *Representation*, Part I. (e) on this Article; Namely, ' This Connexion between an Unrenewed Mans Works and Saving Grace, is *Arminianism*, Condemned by *Confess. Chap. 10. §. 2.* and by many Scriptures quoted for the Proof of the Section.

To which I Answer, 1st, That My Opinion, as delivered above, is not *Arminianism*, and is not to be found among the *Arminian* Errors Rejected by the *Synod of Dort*: Nor is any thing that I have said above, Condemned by this Paragraph, or by any of the Scriptures adduced for Proof of it: And seeing he only Affirms, this Section Condemns My Opinion, without giving any Reason for it, My bare Denyal may be a Sufficient Answer. And, were it Needful, I could go through the several Particulars mentioned above, and shew, that they Agree very well with what is Delivered in this Section, every
Clause

Clause of which I Hold and Teach. But, I think, every Man of Knowledg and Candour, will at first View perceive, there is no Appearance of Opposition between them. I shall only Notice, that Effectual Calling Comprehends Regeneration, with the Whole Work of the Spirit, in Converting a Sinner, until his Conversion be Completed in Justifying Faith: And, as Our *Confession* says here, so I Maintain, that this Effectual Call is of GODs Free and Special Grace Alone, not from any Thing at all Foreseen in Man.

Now, Converting Grace is not the less Free, that God Promiseth to Give it to them that Ask: Nor is it from any Thing Foreseen in Man; seeing their Asking is the Fruit of Gods Eternal Purpose of Love to them.

And, when it is said, 'Man is altogether Passive therein, until, being Quickned and Renewed by the Holy Spirit, he is thereby Enabled to Answer this Call, and to Embrace the Grace Offered and Conveyed in it. This Agrees exactly with what I have said; For, according to Me, Men can neither Believe nor Repent of themselves, nor Change their Own Corrupt Hearts, nor of themselves Embrace Christ, and His Saving Grace Offered in the Gospel. On the Contrary, I say, By the Right Use of the Means and Motives, God has laid before them, they may be Convinced, that they must needs have Renewing Grace from God in Christ: But, altho' they may be Convinced, they Need Grace, and must have it, or Perish, and so Cry to God earnestly for it; Yet they are wholly Passive in Receiving it, and

can Contribute no more to the Work of Regeneration, than the Man Born Blind could do to Our Lords Curing his Eyes, tho' at our Lords Command he went and Washed. *Joh. 9. 7.* Both these are Works of Divine Power, which neither Need nor can Admit of Mans Cooperation. But, if Mr. *Webster* Think, that a Person is not altogether Passive in Regeneration, if he Use any Means in order to Obtain this Grace of God; Then, every Person must Beware of Going to Church, and of Reading or Hearing the Word of God, Praying for Grace, or Employing any Serious Thoughts about it, until he know that he is Regenerated. But, if he may, and be Obligated to Use these Means with the utmost Diligence and Seriousness, and may, for all that, be altogether Passive, when God, by His Spirit, Renews all the Faculties of his Soul and Body, and thereby Enables him to Answer the Gospel Call, and Embrace the Grace Offered and Conveyed in it; So, he may be no less Passive therein, altho' he Use the Means that I have mentioned: Nor does the Connexion, by the Divine Promise, between the Use of the Means and the Receiving of Grace, make him a whit more or less Passive

From the Whole I Conclude, That there is Nothing in what I truly Hold and Teach, with Respect to this *Article*, that is Erroneous, or Contrary to Scripture, or Our *Confession of Faith* and *Catechisms*.

Answer

Answer to *Libel*, Article. VIII.

MR. *Webster* Charges me with Error, "Be-
cause I Find Fault with Reformed Divines,
for Saying, the Soul, coming out of the Crea-
ting Hands of God, is Deprived of Original
Righteousness; And Think, that Depriving of the
Soul thereof is Inconsistent with Gods Justice
and Goodness: And the Reason is, because,
says the *Professor*, Our Souls never Committed
any thing that Deserves such a Sentence: For,
says he, that the Soul is Created as Pure and
Holy, as ever *Adams* was (a).

To which I Answer, that My Opinion is not
very Distinctly and Fully Represented, either in
this *Libel* or *Representation*. It is, in short, This:
I do Think these Divines in the Wrong, who
say, that God Acts the Part of a Judge, when
He Creates the Souls that are to be United to
the Bodies Procreated by *Adam* and his Posterity,
and so Creates them without Original Righte-
ousness; Which I Think a Metaphysical Fancy,
that is Founded neither on Scripture, nor Rea-
son; And do Think it Inconsistent with the Ju-
stice and Goodness of God, to Produce a Rati-
onal Creature without any Dispositions to Good,
much more, to Create it with Inclinations to Evil.
And, the Divines who maintain this Opinion, Con-
tend, against the *Pelagians*, *Papists* and *Armini-
ans*, that there cannot be a Middle State be-
tween these Two, viz. Being Inclined to Good,

P

or

or Inclined to Evil: As *Marckius, Compend. Theol. Cap. 14. § 12.* and *Turretin, Loc. 5. Quæst. 9, § 6, 7.* Yet Human Souls, Since the Fall, must either be Created with Inclinations to Good, or Inclinations to Evil, or in *Puris Naturalibus*, in the *Pelagian* Sense.

I do also Maintain, that God Cannot Act the Part of a Judge in the very Act of Creation, and in Creating Punish it, either for any Sin of its Own (which it could not Possibly be Guilty of), or for *Adams* Sin, which cannot be Imputed to it, until it be once Created and United to the Body; Because, till then, it is not of his Posterity. And when it is United to the Corrupt Body, I see no need of its being by GOD Deprived of its Original Righteousness; Seeing the Influence that such a Body, unto which it is United, must needs have upon it, is abundantly Effectual to Deprive it thereof: And I find nothing in Scripture that Determines this Metaphysical Debate upon the Other Side. I therefore Think, that the Souls of Infants, since the Fall, as they come from the Hands of their Creator, are as Pure and Holy, as the Souls of Infants would have been Created, supposing Man had not Fallen; And that they are Created as Pure and Holy as *Adams* was Created, except as to these Qualifications and Habits which he Received as being Created in an Adult State, which Infants of his Race had wanted, supposing he had not Fallen.

Mr. *Webster* Asserteth, that these are Gross Errors, Contrary to *Rom. 5. 12---20* and to *Cor. 15. 21, 22.*

In Answer, I Assert, that they are not at all Errors, nor Contrary to these Passages of Scripture. They are not Contrary to Rom. 5. 12. *By one Man Sin entered into the World, and Death by Sin, &c.* Seeing I Own, that the Soul cannot become Sinful, until by Union with the Body it become one of *Adams* Posterity; And then, I Maintain, it is Polluted, and Liable to Death. But I cannot Reconcile with this Text his Opinion, according to which the Soul becomes a Sinner before it be in *Adam*, and so must become a Sinner by an Act of GODs Sovereignty, Exercised in its Creation, and not by Reason of its being in *Adam*; And so, all have not Sinned in *Adam*, but before they were in him. The same is to be said of the other Text, and it must be Read thus, to make it Agree with his Opinion; *For since by GOD, but not by Man, came Death*, viz. of Sin and Punishment, v. 21. And accordingly v. 22. *For as in GOD, but not in Adam, all Die*, viz. in the Sin, and are Liable to the Punishment of Death due for it.

In Mr. *Webster* Alledges further, that it is Contrary to the Places of Our *Larger* and *Shorter Catechisms*, concerning the State of Sin and Misery: Which I Deny, for the Reasons just now given. For, the Souls must be Created and United to the Bodies Procreated, before they can be Human Persons, and of *Adams* Race, and so have his Sin Imputed to them: But, as soon as they are thus Constituted of his Posterity, it is Imputed unto them; And they are thereby brought into a State of Sin and Misery.

I have formerly given Mr. *Webster* Sufficient Evidence to Convince him, that I do not Maintain the Propagation of Corruption, without the Imputation of *Adams* Sin; Which Imputation is the Reason, why Corrupt Bodies, that Vitiate the Souls United to them, are Propagated.

I am well pleased with Mr. *Websters* Design of Refuting this Opinion of Mine elsewhere, and wish he had taken this Method with all the other Articles of his *Libel*, except what Required Probation by Witnesses; And, in Case his Refutation shall Teach me any Truth I know not, or Convince me of Error, I Promise, that I will, through Divine Assistance, Acknowledge his Kindness in as public a Manner as he shall Refute Me: For, I Pretend not to Perfection or Infallibility; On the Contrary, I Profess my Self only a Student, and hope to do so while on Earth. But, if he shall Fight against His Own Shadow, or a Man of Straw of his own Making, or Publish a Refutation that Confutes it self, as these in his Representation generally do, I will not Promise to take Notice of it, or Employ Time or Paper needlessly about it. I shall only give him this Caution, that, in Refuting me, he must Refute the Learned *Chamier*, & Mention no others, who, in his *Panstrat. Cathol.* Tom. 3. Lib. 1. Cap. 7. §. 12, Having told, how the Body Vitiates the Soul, and having given the Instance of *Eve*, says, *Cum igitur tum temporis Anima a Creatione pura, non minus, quam quæ quotidie creantur in Utero, consenserit Corpori, atque ita fuerit Corrupta: quid mirum, si et quæ in utero creantur, ipsæ sponte consentientes Corpori corrupto, corrumpantur etiam &c.*

From the Whole, I Conclude, that there is Nothing in this Article that is Relevant.

Answer to Libel, Class I. Article IX.

MR. Webster Libell's, That the Professor Denies, that the Necessity of Eternal Punishment flows from Sin, as it is an Offence Committed against an Infinite Majesty. Represent. Part 1. (a) And in his Libel (b) it runs thus, Our Author says, that Necessity of Eternal Punishment follows from Sin its being an Offence Committed against an Infinite Majesty; But this doth not make it Necessary

Before I Answer, I must here take Notice, once for all, that, in Explaining the System, I always Teach in Latin; And Mr. Websters Informer, whether Mediat or Immediat I know not, who Personates a Scholar of Mine, appears plainly to Understand very ill his Mother-tongue; How he Understood the Latin I spake, I cannot Determine; But, I am sure, he has Understood the Sense very ill, and gives always an Indistinct or Imperfect, and several Times an Unfair and False Account of what I Teach: So, I hope, none will Charge me with the Faults either of the Language or Sense, Contained in this Libel. As to the Faults of Mr. Websters Language, I do not Meddle with them; it being sufficient to My Purpose, if I can Apprehend His Meaning.

P 3

Now

(a) P. 38. (b) P. 7.

Fro

Now, for Answer to this Charge, I say, it is False, that ever I Taught any such Thing; Or Denied, that Eternal Punishment Necessarily flows from Sin, on Account of its Offending an Infinite Majesty.

What I Teach, is, That this is not the Only Reason of the Eternity of Punishment; And I Add Two more to it. And seeing I have what I Teach on this Point, in a Manuscript, by me, I shall Insert the Conclusion that I Prove. *Unde liquet Pœnarum Æternitatem esse necessariam, non tantum quia contra Majestatem Infinite Excelsam delinquitur, verum etiam quia minimum Peccatum Æternam Legislatori Subditisque Injuriam infert; atque præterea, Æterna Pœna Legis Sanctionem necessario constituit.*

This is what I Teach, and I Challenge Mr Webster to Prove his Allegation, which, I know he cannot Do by Honest Witnesses; And therefore, I am not Concern'd, altho' this Opinion he Ascribes to me, were Contrary to the Questions of Our Catechisms and the Scriptures mentioned by him; And yet, I think, by all his Skill, he will not be Able to Prove, that it is Contrary either to these Questions or Scriptures. Seeing it may be Agreeable to the Wisdom, Justice, and Power of GOD, in His Law to Threaten Eternal Punishment, for Holy and Just Ends, altho' it were true, that it did not Necessarily flow from the Infinite Excellency of His Majesty. For, Supposing, that GOD, by a Free and Arbitrary Act of His Will, had Threatned Eternal Punishment for every Sin, even the least.

In this Case, every Sin would Deserve GOD

Wrath

Wrath and Curse, both in this Life and that which is to come: For Sin always Deserves the Punishment Threatned in GODs Law, which is the Rule and Measure of what Sin Deserves. And so, what is said in the *Questions* and *Scriptures* mentioned, is not Contradicted by these who Maintain the Proposition Libelled, if they Grant, that GOD has Threatned Eternal Punishment for every Sin.

I am not Concerned with what Dr. *Tillotson* says on this Head, and I shall be very well pleased to see Mr. *Websters* Confutation, either of what, I have told him, is My Opinion, or, of the Opinion he Falsly ascribes to me: Only, as a Friend, I Advise him, that, in Refuting the Last of these, he will Refute the Learn'd and Holy *Rutherford* (whom he justly Esteems, as I also do) who Derives the Eternity of Punishment from the Arbitrary Will of GOD, and not from its Deserving it, as being an Offence against an Infinite Majesty; As appears from his *Exerc. Apolog.* whereof I shall give an Instance or two. *Exercit. 2. Cap. 3. Sect. 3.* 'Nam inobedientes finaliter damnari justum est, quia ita Deus libere decrevit, quando finaliter inobedientium potuit Deus citra jacturam & dispendium Justitiæ absolute misereri, si quidem ita voluit.-----Ideoque Deus nulla naturæ necessitate peccata punit, imo posset absolute non punire. Nam tantum juxta liberum beneplacitum punit. *And Sect. 10.* Poterat enim hominibus nullam regulam præscripsisse, sicut fecit agentibus naturalibus, ita, ut si vel homines & angeli sequerentur rationis ductum, sive non, rei non forent peccati quia nempe liberum relinque-

re poterat iis illum ductum sequi, vel non sequi, quoniam lex est liberrimum Dei statutum, si nihil tale statuisset, turpe aut peccatum nullum fuisset. *Señ 12. Resp. Obj. 3^{tie}.* At vero absolute Deus nihil extra se vult aut facit, cujus contrarium non potest velle aut facere. *Señ 13.* Prohibere Dei amorem, non pugnat simpliciter cum Dei natura, sed cum voluntate libera. In which things, I Own, I am not of Mr. *Rutherford's* Opinion, as it seems Mr. *Webster* is not; and I shall be content to see his Refutation of them.

Upon the Whole of this Article, I Conclude, that the Proposition mentioned above, is Falsly Alledged; And the Whole Article is Irrelevant.

Answer to Libel, Class I. Art. X. Class II.
Art. VIII.

THis Article, in his Representation, Part 1st, Runs thus (a). *That after the Last Judgement, there will be No Sinning in Hell; And, That the Damned shall be made to Acquiesce in, and Acknowledge the Justice of God, in Punishing them.*

To which I Answer, 1st, That the Latter Part of this, viz. *They shall be Made to Acquiesce &c.* Is not a Way of Speaking, that I Use: And I do not at all Remember, that ever I Expressed My Mind, in these Terms. But, if all that is meant, Be, That they are under a Full, and Clear Conviction of the Justice of the Sentence, that leaves

no Ground of Doubt of its Equity ; And that they are, by the Power of GOD, Retrained from the Least Repining Thought against it ; I Grant, This is My Opinion ; Which yet cannot be very fitly Expressed by the Word *Acquiesce*, because it is Ordinarily taken, to signifie Quiet, Satisfaction, and Peace of Mind in any Thing ; Which Sense is Inconsistent with My Opinion, and with the State of the Damned. In like Manner, if Nothing be Meant, by *Acknowledging the Justice of GOD*, but the Foresaid Conviction, and Not Repining, I Own it to be My Opinion ; But, if Understood of *Active Acknowledgements thereof in Hell*, then it Agrees not with it ; Yet, I think it Probable, that GOD may Oblige the Damned Openly to Acknowledge the Justice of His Sentence, before They be taken from His Tribunal, and Cast into Hell : But if Mr. *Webster*, or any Body else, Think Otherwise, I do not Reclaim.

2ly, I do Think, There will be No Sinning in Hell, after the Last Judgement ; Not, because the Damned will then have Their Natures Renewed, and Sanctified, and Voluntarily, or of Choice, Abtain from Sin ; But, because They will then, by the Power of GOD, be put in a State Purely Passive, being Plunged into the Lowest Abyss of Suffering, wherein, They will have no more Exercise of their Rational Faculties, than shall be Necessary, 1. To make them Due-ly Sensible of the Tormenting Flames of Divine Vengeance ; And, 2ly. To make them Perceive, with the Utmost Perplexity, Horror, and Amazement, the Train of their Wicked Actions, and

Cor-

Corrupt Inclinations, while on Earth, that GOD Sets in Order before them. And 3. To Cause them Entertain Clear and Silencing Convictions of the Equity and Justice of GODs Sentence.

Now, This Exercise, or Use of the Rational Faculties, I have sometimes Called *Action*; Only, that I may Distinguish this Passive State of the Damned, from a Passive State of Stocks and Stones, which, *Some* have said, must be Their Condition, unless they can Commit Actual Sin: But, by what I have now said, I hope, it will be Evident, to People of Knowledge and Ingenuity, that there is a Vast Difference between the Two; Stocks and Stones, being Capable of Feeling no Pain &c. So, I Use the Word *Action*, in the Large Sense, to Signify any Perception, Agreeing to an Intelligent Creature. But, if Actions be taken more Strictly, for what a Person does Freely, Willingly, or of Choice; then I say, no such Actions are Consistent with this Passive State of the Damned, which Leaves no Room for Choice, or Voluntary Determination of the Mind; Nor does it Allow or Admit of the least Wandering Thought from what they are Unalterably Fixed unto, by the Almighty and Avenging Power of GOD, made up of the Three Particulars Mentioned, which Comprehend, at least, the Principal Part of Their Eternal Misery. The First may be Called *Passive Sensations*, to Distinguish them from These which Men Desire and Choose, while on Earth. The 2d. may be Called *Passive Reflections*; Because, this is Common to them with Peoples Reflections, while on Earth, that Themselves and Their Actions are the Tormenting Ob-

jects

jects of their Thoughts : And because they are, by the Power of GOD, laid under an Absolute Necessity of this Perplexing Sight of their Wicked Natures and Actions : I Call them *Passive Reflections*, for Want of a Fitter Word.

From this Account of the State of the Damned, I think, it is Evident, that they are not Capable of Doing either Good or Evil ; and that they are not Capable of the least Thought, or Motion, that is Materially Evil, or Contrary to the Eternal Law of Nature ; Altho' their Natures remain as Corrupt as ever. And, as this State Renders them Incapable of being under the Preceptive Part of the Law ; So, God, in his Infinite Wisdom and Power, does keep them in Perfect Subjection, and Moral Dependance, suitable to their State, by Inflicting the Punishment Threatned in the Sanction of His Law, which is every Way Sufficient for that End.

Now, this I shall not Essay to Prove in this Place ; Only, I say it Agrees Exactly with the Account given us in Scripture, of the State of the Damned ; Where we are told, *They shall stand speechless; be Bound Hand and Foot, Cast into outer darkness, and into the Lake, that burns with Fire and Brimstone, where the Worm dies not, and the Fire is not Quenched, where there is Weeping and Wailing, and Gnashing of Teeth.* Where we have not the least Hint of their Acting from Choice, much less, of Liberty to Commit Sin : But on the Contrary, a Plain Representation of Silencing Convictions, of Close and Powerful Restraint, of Renting Thoughts of their Own Sin and Folly, and of the most Dreadful, and Exquisite Torments, Discovering Them-

Themselves by their proper Signs, such as *Weeping, Wailing, & Gnasping of Teeth*: Which among Men on Earth, are Usual Signs of Great Trouble and Uneasiness. To which I add, That unless the Punishment of the Damned Restrain them from Sinning, GOD could not be thereby Glorified: For the Only thing that Dishonours GOD, is Sin, and the Only Way, to Repair His Honour, is, to Inflict Due Punishment for it; But, if the Damned in Hell, do Continue to Commit Sin, to all Eternity, and that even more hainously than they do in Time, *as some would have it*, then 'tis Impossible for GOD, to Repair His Honour, by Inflicting a Due Punishment for these Sins, that are Eternally Increasing, because Finite Creatures are not Capable of such Punishment; And the Threatning of Eternal Wrath, for every Sin, could not possibly be Executed, if Sins Increased Eternally; And so, upon this Supposition, the Condemning Sinners unto Hell Torments, and the Executing this Sentence, instead of Repairing the Honour of GOD, Injured by Sin, would be the most Effectual Method, to Perpetuat his Dishonour, beyond Possibility of Redress. But this I may Prove Elsewhere, if I find it Necessary.

Mr. *Webster* Alledges, *this is Solidly Refuted, by the Reverend Mr. James Hog, in a late small Treatise.*

To which I Answer, That I must Beg Leave to Differ from Mr. *Webster* in This; And, with all Deference to the Reverend Mr. *Hog*, I Think, He has either Acted the Part of the Man, who *Answereth a Matter, before He Heareth it*; Or else, has Widely Mistaken, what it was, he Designed to

to Refute. For, there is not in his Whole Performance, the Least Appearance of One Solid Argument, againit any Branch of My Opinion; as, I think, will be Evident to every Knowing and Impartial Reader, who Compares it with what is said Above: In which Account of My Opinion there is *Nothing that Tends to Atheism, or to set the Sufferings of the Damned, with Respect to their Patience, on a Level with, or above, the Sufferings of Our Lord Jesus Christ, as he Fancies.*

The only Thing, I shall here Notice in Mr. Hogs Letter, Concerning Natural Enmity, Relating to this Opinion of Mine, is, what he says, Pag. 36. 'I come next, 8thly, to take under View, a very Singular Opinion, viz. *That there is No Sin in Hell, Or, that there will be None, after the Solemn Trial, and Condemnation of Reprobate Angels and Men, at the Great Day.* I know not, if any ever had the Face, to Publish this Position; But that it is Asserted, and Defended Resolutely, is so Generally Known, that, were it not Matter of Common Discourse, and Heavy Regret to Many of the Excellent Ones of the Earth amongst Us, I should be very Loth to Mention any Thing about it. Nay, My Soul would rather Eccho to the Least Insinuation of such a Wicked Thing, *Tell it not in Gath, Publish it not in the Streets of Askelon.*

Now, to Convince Mr. Hog, and Other Excellent Ones in the Earth, among Us, that the Asserting, *there will be no Sinning in Hell, after the Last Judgement,* is not so very Singular an Opinion,

Opinion, or so Wicked a Thing, as they have Imagined: And to shew them, That several Eminent Divines, have had the Face to Publish this Position, some of Whom, were, at least, as Excellent Ones of the Earth, as any among Us; I shall beg Leave, to Insert the following Passages. 1st. *Augustin, Enchirid. ad Laurentium* Cap. III. says, 'Post Resurrectionem vero facto universo impletoque Judicio, suos Fines habebunt Civitates Duæ, Una Christi, Altera Diaboli; Una Bonorum, Altera Malorum, utraque tamen Angelorum et Hominum. *Istis Voluntas, Illis Facultas non poterit ulla esse Pecandi; vel Ulla Conditio Moriendi, &c.* To whom I add *Prosper Aquitanicus, De vita Contemplativa, Lib. 3. Cap. 12. p. 271. Edit. Colon.* Where He Expounds this Text of Scripture, *Ligate Eos Manibus & Pedibus, et mittite in tenebras Exteriores, &c.* thus, 'Et quid est Obmutescentes, Manibus et Pedibus ligari, nisi in Inferno, ubi Deo nemo Confitetur, actione Privari.-----Fletus autem, et stridor Dentium, acerrimos Eorum dolores ostendunt, qui supplicio æternæ Mortis ad dicti, non ridendi sensum habituri sunt, sed Dolendi &c.

I shall at Present Name no more of the Ancient Christian Doctors for this Opinion; But

2dly, I shall add Two of the Most Eminent Schoolmen, viz. *Bonaventura, & Albertus Magnus*, who are of the same Opinion; Whose Words, for Brevities sake, I shall not set down. See *Bonaventura in Lib. 4. Sentent. Dist. 50. Quæst. 1. & Albertus Magnus in Comment. in Sentent.* Who do both handle this Question at Considerable

able
3d
Stras
Hode
lates
Divin
cator
4l
ford
ing.
of an
in hi
he sa
firm
these
gives
tise
pleat
Answ
ing
conju
pient
& c
Whic
ture,
of W
the
like
teced
And
Spec
when

able Length.

3dly, I Name a Famous Lutheran Divine, at Strasburg, Joann. Conrad. Dannhauerus, who in *Hodosophia*, Phænom. 4. p. 258. (as *Fechtius* Relates) says, (a) *Videtur Probabilius, et ad Gloriam Divinam justius----- fore Blasphemiarum et Peccatorum contra Deum----- Modum ac Terminum.*

4ly, I Mention, of Our Reformed Divines, *Sanford* and *Parker*, both Eminent for Piety and Learning. Our Famous *Rutherford* Calls *Parker*, a Man of an Excellent Spirit for Holiness and Learning, in his *Peaceable Plea*. P. 33. And Ch. 16. p. 231, he says, *Very Reverend and Holy Men hold the Affirmative*, and Names Mr. *Parker*, *De Polit.* And these and the like, are the Ordinary Epithets he gives him. Now, This *Parker*, in *Sanfords* Treatise *De Descensu Christi ad Inferos*, which he Completed, and Published after *Sanfords* Death, does Answer this Popish Objection against Christs Suffering the Pains of Hell, *Pœna Infernalis cum Peccato conjuncta est &c.* in these Words, *At Recepta Sapientum Opinio est, in Inferno non Peccari: quæ & certissima Ratione nititur.* Lib. 3. P. 174. Which he Proves at great Length, from Scripture, Fathers, and Reason. Neither did he, out of Weakness, Deny the Antecedent, in stead of the Consequence, as Some would have it; But like a Skilfull Divine, he first Proves the Antecedent to be False, and then the Consequence. And here, I must Notice in the By, what a fine Specimen Mr. *Webster* gives us of His Learning, when he says, *he knows not, if I have taken this Notion of*

(a) De statu Damnatorum, pag. 20.

of not Sinning in Hell from Sanfords Latine Treatise on the Creed, or, from Jurieu, *De Pace inter Protestantes* (b), By which it Appears, he has not so much as Read the Title Page of Sanford, and Parkers Book, else he would have Understood, that it is only a Treatise, *De Descensu Domini nostri Jesu Christi ad Inferos*: And 'tis Manifest, that he does not at all know, what is the Opinion of Sanford and Parker or of Jurieu on this Point; for they widely Differ; The former saying Lib. 3. P. 174. *Et cui quæso ignotum est Infernum tantum patiendi Locum esse, non autem agendi, quodque Anima Dammati Hominis ita Pœnis obruatur, ut ne Cogitationem quidem ullam concipere possit quæ ad Peccatum vergit.* But Jurieu says, 'Et inde petenda Ratio quare cum Dammati in Inferis nova semper sint perpetraturi Crimina, Blasphemias Blasphemiis accumulando, non tamen augebitur eorum Reatus & Poena; Ratio inquam est, quod ubi cessaverit Legislatio, cessabit etiam Reatus. P. II. De Pace inter Protestantes; Which is as near a Kin to Mr. Websters Opinion, as to Mine, which is much the same with Parkers, tho' I got it not from him, but had it several Years, before I saw any of the Authors Mentioned.

I am Glad to find Mr. Webster for Once Commend the Pious and Learned Mr. Campbell, whose Memory is very Dear to Me; And I wish, I were Able to follow his Good Example. I had never the Happiness of seeing any of his Notes, or of knowing before now, that he Refuted This Opinion

Opinion of *Jurieu*; Yet, I can Assure Mr. *Webster*, that I do also Refute it Yearly, and am Glad to find, that so Great a Divine has done it before me.

I might, after *Sanford* and *Parker*, Name *Maccovius*, who in his *Loc. Com. Cap. Ult.* Maintains the same Opinion with *Sanford* and *Parker*, as he does more fully in his *Theol. Polemic. Cap. 25. Quæst. 5.*

These, to Name no more, I hope, may Satisfy Mr. *Hog*, that he should have studied, at least; the History of this Point of Divinity better; before he had wrote so of it, as he does in the Passage mention'd. I may, perhaps; elsewhere Consider his Arguments; and also Mr. *Websters*; The First of which is the same with Mr. *Hogs* and does not strike against my Opinion. Mr. *Websters* 2d Argument is, That they are Guilty of Sins of Omission, which, I say, they Cannot be Guilty of, because they neither are, nor can be under the Preceptive Part of the Law, after the Last Judgement, when the Last Punishment shall be Inflicted. And that Mr. *Webster* may not think this a Criminal Novelty in me; I shall Insert a Passage from Dr. *Owens* Book on *Justification*; Chap. 12. page 381, 382, 383. Where he Proposes this Question, *Whether the First Intention and Obligation of the Law unto Obedience doth Cease to Affect the Sinner, or Continue so, as at the same Time to Oblige him unto Obedience and Punishment, both its Powers being in Act towards him?* And Answers it thus,

'Had the Punishment Threatned been Immediately Inflicted, unto the Utmost, of what
Q was

' was Contained in it, this could have been no Question; For Man had Died Immediately, both Temporally and Eternally, and had been cast out of that State, wherein alone he could stand in any Relation unto the Preceptive Power of the Law. He that is finally Executed hath Fulfilled the Law, so that he Ows no more Obedience to it &c. He speaks to the same Purpose in the Forecited *Exercit.* 8. Vol. I. *Heb.* p. 79.

Which Words of the Doctor will not bear the Gloss of some, *That only all Tyes, with Respect to the Means of the Dispensation of Grace, must necessarily Cease*; for he speaks of the Law of Creation given to *Adam*.

The only way of Reconciling this Opinion with the true Notions of the Eternal Law, by which all Rational Creatures, while they have a Being, are Subjected to the Sovereign Dominion of GOD, in my humble Opinion, is, That the Final Sentence Inflicted on Sinners, lays them under the most Dreadful Sufferings, and perfectly Restrains them from the least Act of Sin.

Mr. *Websters* 3d Argument is not against My Opinion; For, I Own *Passive Reflections*, such as the Damned are Capable of, with a Full and Perpetual Conviction of the Justice of GODs Sentence: And their Sufferings leave no Room for the least *Impatient or Fretful Thought*; Neither is there any such Thing Insinuated by *Gnashing of Teeth*, which cannot be an Expression of Rage, in any of these Places where 'tis applied to the Damned; altho' it be so taken, *Acts* 7. 54. and several Other Places; By Applying of which to the Case of the Damned, Mr. *Webster* gives but

a So
ture
him
us,
The
Exp
we
sider
or
ple
not
Thou
2l
Way
Distin
sing
Job
So Ps
it is E
a Per
ces in
People
10.
Expre
as we
7. 54
Verb,
a Per
Greek
fy Eit
but is
by the
by a
Expre

1. Sorry Proof of his Skill in Expounding Scripture: To Convince him whereof, I would have him Consider 1st, That Experience Teacheth us, there is a Twofold Gnashing of the Teeth; The One, wherein we are *Active*, and thereby Express *Anger* or *Rage*; The Other, wherein we are wholly *Passive*, flowing from any Considerable Uneasiness, such as, Cold, Intense Pain, or Convulsion: Which *Gnashing of Teeth*, People are sometimes Subject unto, when they are not Entertaining the least *Fretful* or *Angry* Thought.

2ly, The Scripture speaks of these Two Ways of *Gnashing the Teeth*, so as Clearly to Distinguish the One from the Other, Expressing the Former always by an *Active Verb*; As *Job* 16. 9. *He Gnashed upon me with his Teeth*. So *Psal.* 35. 16. & 37. 12. In which Three Places it is Expressly said, *They Gnashed their Teeth against a Person*; And, there are but Two Other Places in the Old Testament where we Read of Peoples Gnashing their Teeth, viz. *Psal.* 112. 10. and *Lam.* 2. 16. In both which it is Expressed by an *Active Verb* in the Original, as well as in Our English Bibles. And in *Acts* 7. 54. It is not only Expressed by the *Active Verb*, but also, has Subjoined, that it is *against a Person*. In *Mark* 9. 18. the Word in the Greek is Different, and does not Properly signify Either of these Sorts of Gnashing of Teeth; but is Meant of a Particular Sound, Produced by their being Squeezed together, and Distorted by a Convulsive Motion; which cannot be an Expression of Rage or Anger in that Place.

Now, these are all the Passages of Scripture, that speak of Gnashing the Teeth, except where it is Applied to the Damned: And wherever in Scripture it is Applied to them, it is always so Expressed as to Signify a *Passive Gnashing of the Teeth*, as the Phrase ἔσσι βρυγμός τῶν ὀδόντων, constantly used, does plainly Import: Whence 'tis Evident, that no Place of Scripture, that speaks of Gnashing of Teeth among the Damned, can be Understood to be an Expression of their Rage; but only of their Extreme Sufferings, and Terrible Convulsions.

I Conclude, this *Article* is Irrelevant. In Answer to Mr. *Websters* Compliment, in Praying, that I may Obtain the Poets Wish, I acknowledge his Kindness, for Exercising as much Charity toward me, as a Heathen Poet could do, and Praying, that I may Obtain what the Heathen thought the Best Wish, which I Own to be a Valuable Blessing, that both He and I have much need of: And, in Return, I Pray, that he may not only Obtain that Favour, but that the LORD may also, of his Free Grace, Grant Him a Spirit of Love, and of Power, and of a Sound Mind.

I now Proceed to Answer These *Articles*, in the II. Class of *Errors* in Mr. *Websters* Principal *Libel*, and II. Part of His *Representation*, that are not Comprehended in, or Joyned with the Preceeding X. *Articles*; And so have not as yet been Answered: The First whereof is

Class II. Error VI.

THis *Error*, He Alledges, I Vented in the Conference with the Ministers at *Edinburgh*, in these Words,

Fustli-

Justifying Faith, Includes in its Formal Conception and Nature, Good Works and Obedience (a).

Ans. I Deny, that ever this was, or now is, My Opinion, or that I Vented it at that Conference, or any where else. And I Crave, that He may be Obliged to Prove, that I have Owned or Vented this, as My Opinion; Or, that I Hold the *Socinian* or *Arminian* Propositions, Mentioned in his *Representation* (b); And in Case he Succumb in his Probation, as I am sure he will, I Crave, he may be Censured, as so Gross a Calumny Deserves.

Now, to Convince the Presbytery, and all other Men of Sense and Probity, that I have Good Ground to Deny this Charge; I shall from the Original Paper, I then Read to him, before the Ministers, Insert his Question, with my Answer to it.

Quest. 5th. Doth Faith which is the Antecedent Condition of the Covenant of Grace, and of Justification, Include in its Nature, Obedience to the Whole Moral Law? Doth the Act of Faith, qua Justifying, layhold on Christ, qua Lord, and Include in its Nature a Sincere Engagement to a Holy Life, and Good Works? Which Question, the Presbytry may easily Perceive, is very Confused and Ambiguous: However the Answer I gave to it was.

'The Branches of this Question are Propounded in such Doubtful Expressions, that I do not Comprehend Your Meaning, and therefore am

Q 3

at

at a Loss, how to give a Distinct Answer to them.

1st, By the Antecedent Condition, I Suppose, you do not Mean a Condition in the Strict Law Sense, when Applied to Conditional Contracts among Men; But something, that is Necessarily Joined with, and must needs, in Order of Nature, at least, Preceed a Persons Actual Interest in the Covenant of Grace, as made with Elect Believers, and Consequently go before his Justification.

2ly, I do not see, how Faith can be said to Include in its Nature, Obedience to the Moral Law, except in these three Respects. (1) That it is a Duty Required by the Moral Law; Or, (2) That Obedience to the Moral Law, is its Object; Or, (3) That it Influenceth Obedience.

In the First Sense, it is Evident, that no One, nor all the Acts of Faith Include Obedience to the Whole Moral Law; seeing they are not all the Duties Required by it.

In the 2d (Sense) some Acts of Faith, that necessarily preceed a Persons Interest in the Covenant, *Include in their Nature, or have for their Object*, Obedience to the whole Moral Law, Others, Disobedience to it, and Others Abstract from both. An Example of the First and Second are some Acts of Faith, Exercised when the Holy Spirit Convinces of Sin and Misery, by some of which a Person doth firmly Believe, that it was his Duty to Obey the Whole Moral Law, on Pain of Damnation; and by others he is Convinced, that he is Guilty of Disobeying the Whole Law of God, and so is fallen

under

under its Curse. Examples of the 3^d (*that Abstract from both*) are such as these Exercised, when the Spirit Enlightens the Mind in the Knowledge of Christ.

In the 3^d Respect, (*or Sense*) viz. Faiths Influencing Obedience, it is Evident, that all Acts of Saving Faith, whether they go before, or Follow a Persons Interest in the Covenant and Justification, do Influence, in some Degree, less or more, Obedience to the Whole Moral Law; upon which Account it is Called by the Apostle, *the Obedience of Faith*.

A 3^d Thing I do not Understand is, *qua Justifying* and *qua Lord*, which are Words I can make no Sense of; nor can I Perceive, that they can Serve for any other End, but to Darken the Truth, tho' perhaps, by the Ideas you have Affixed to them, they may Clear it to you. If your Meaning in Plain Scotch, be, whether Every Act of Faith, whereby we Accept of Christ and His Righteousness, that is Prerequisite to Our Interest in the Covenant, and Justification, be an Accepting of Him under the Notion of Our Lord and Supreme Governour; Then I say, *It is not*, as in the Act, by which we Receive Him as our Priest, and his Sacrifice as the Meritorious Cause of All Saving Benefits, of Grace and Glory. Or, if you mean, whether that Act of Faith, whereby we Receive Christ as our Lord, be Prerequisite to Our Justification, together with the other Acts of Saving Faith, that necessarily Preceed it; then I say, *It is*, because we must Receive a Whole Christ, or Accept of Him, and His Righteousness,

‘ not only for Pardon and Glory, but also for
 ‘ *Wisdom and Sanctification*: and (*must*) En-
 ‘ gage in the Strength of His Grace, to Study sin-
 ‘ cere Obedience to the whole Law, before we be
 ‘ Pardoned or Justified: According to what I
 ‘ told you in my Former, upon the 3^d Head;
 (viz, in my Letter to Mr. Webster Feb. 23. 1713)
 ‘ which Doctrine is plainly Taught in Our Conf.
 ‘ Chap. 14. §. 2. and 15. §. 2, 3. Proved from the
 ‘ Words of Our Lord Luke 13. 3. 5. To which you
 ‘ may Add the other Passages in Our Confess. there
 ‘ Cited, and that of Dr. Owens Book on *Justification*
 ‘ p. 299, 300, 301.

Now, it is Manifest, That in this Answer I
 Assert no such Thing, as, *That Justifying Faith*
Includes in its formal Conception and Nature,
good Works and Obedience; For, 1st, I De-
 termine the Meaning of that Doubtful Expres-
 sion in Mr. Websters Question, viz. *Faith, which*
is the Antecedent Condition of the Covenant of
Grace, and of Justification; and take it for any
 One, or All of these Acts of Faith, which are
 Necessarily Joyned with, and must needs, in Or-
 der of Nature, at least, preceed a Persons Actu-
 al Interest in the Covenant of Grace, as made
 with Elect Believers, and Consequently must go
 before Justification. 2^{dly}, I Explain that Doubt-
 ful Expression, *doth Faith in its Nature Include*
Obedience to the Law; of which I give Three
 Senses, and have not as yet been able to find
 out a Fourth Sense of it. The First is, That
 the Act of Faith is an Act of Obedience, Or,
 Faith is a Duty Commanded in the Law; So,
 the Meaning of the Question will be, *Is Faith,*

that
 Obed
 I An
 One,
 tion,
 TH
 to th
 is An
 its N
 Mean
 which
 Mora
 on in
 Faith
 Objec
 and C
 for E
 Perform
 an A
 believes
 was l
 Law,
 like
 beyed
 Law
 And b
 Our J
 Acts
 have
 Objec
 bout
 Him.
 The
 long t

that Necessarily goes before Justification, All the Obedience Required in the Moral Law? To which I Answer, That it is Evident, that neither any One, nor All the Acts of Faith Preceeding Justification, are All the Duties Required by the Moral Law.

The 2d Sense I Name, is, That Obedience to the Moral Law is the Object of Faith; Which is Another Way, that Obedience may belong to its Nature; And, according to this Sense, the Meaning of the Question will be; *Has Faith, which preceeds Justification, Obedience to the VVhole Moral Law, for its Object?* And, to the Question in this Sense I Answer, That some Acts of Faith that Preceed Justification, have for their Object, Obedience to the Whole Moral Law, and Others of them have Disobedience to it: As for Example, when the Holy Ghost Convinces a Person of Sin and Misery, the Person Exercises an Act of Saving Faith, whereby he firmly Believes, that Obedience to the Whole Moral Law was his Duty; And so, Obedience to the Whole Law, is the Object of this Act of Faith; In like Manner, when he Believes that he has Disobeyed the Whole Law, Disobedience to the Whole Law is the Object of this Act of Saving Faith: And both these Acts of Saving Faith preceed Our Justification. I tell him further, that some Acts of Saving Faith, that Preceed Justification, have neither Obedience, nor Disobedience, for their Object; such as are some of these Exercised about Christ, and the Method of Salvation by Him.

The 3d, Sense, in which Obedience may belong to the Nature of Faith, is, that Faith Influenceth

fluenceth Obedience; And so, the Meaning of the Question will be, *Does Faith, that preceeds Justification, any way Influence Obedience to the whole Moral Law?* To which I Answer, that it is Evident, that all Acts of Saving Faith whether they go before, or follow our Interest in the Covenant and Justification, do in some Degree, less or more, Influence Obedience to the whole Moral Law.

And the Truth of this I still Maintain; For, the Apostle tells us, *True Saving Faith is that which works by Love*, and Calls the Obedience of Believers *the Obedience of Faith*; And the Faith, that doth not Influence Obedience, is but Counterfeit. And as this is the Apostles Doctrine, so Dr. Owen follows him, in the place Cited by Mr. Webster viz. Pag. 139. 140. Where, in Opposition to the Socinians and Papists (who according to Him suppose, that there may be True Evangelical Faith required as our Duty, and Accepted of GOD, and Contain all in it which is Comprised in the Name and Duty of Faith, and yet be without Charity and Obedience) the Doctor says, *To suppose such a thing is a Monstrous Imagination*; And below, shews in several Particulars, *how Impossible it is, according to Their Principles, who Believe Justification by Faith Alone, that Justifying Faith should be without a sincere Purpose of Heart, to Obey GOD in all things*: Where Mr. Webster, or any Body else, may see, that Dr. Owen Teaches and Proves the very same Thing which I here Assert. I desire Mr. Webster may Read over again these Pages, and Compare them with this Account of My Opinion, and then, I hope, he will be Con-

vinced

vinced, that it is as Opposite to the Opinion of the Socinians, Papists, and Arminians, as Dr. Owens Opinion is. And I humbly Conceive, the best Way to Expose and Refute the Error of the Socinians, Papists and Arminians, or Others, who talk, *that Obedience to the Moral Law is Included in the Nature of Saving or Justifying Faith*, is, to Determine the Sense of that Ambiguous Proposition, as I have done; and then to Consider in which of these Senses, Obedience to the whole Moral Law is Included in the Nature of Faith. In My Opinion the only Sense in which Obedience can be said to be Included in the Nature of Justifying Faith, as Justifying, is, *that it is Influenced by this Faith as a Vital Principle; or, is the fruit it Natively brings forth*: And therefore, the Socinians, who Acknowledge no other Faith, but the Belief of the Truth of GODs Commands and the Promises of Pardon and Heaven upon their sincere Obedience, and make Obedience to be of the Essence of this Faith as it Justifies, or Obedience to the End of their Life, flowing from this Faith, to be the Condition of Justification, or the Way appointed of GOD, for Obtaining Pardon of Sin, and a Right to Eternal Life; do Manifestly Found their Justification *on their Own works, and Gods Acceptilation, without any Relation at all to the Satisfaction of Christ*: And Others, who maintain Faith in Christs Satisfaction, and say, that Justifying Faith Includes in its Nature Obedience, any other way, than as it Influenceth it, do, in so far, mix Works with Faith. Which Errors I am as much against as Mr. Webster, and take pains to Refute them in all their Forms, that I have seen;
and

and Teach the Contrary Doctrine of Our *Confession* and *Catechisms* on this Head.

As to the Other Part of Mr. *Webster's* Question, I think, it is plain, I Assert nothing but what is Manifestly the Doctrine of Our *Confession*, and is Taught by Dr. *Owen* in the Pages Named by Mr. *Webster*, and also in these Cited by Me in the forefaid Answer to his Question at *Edinburgh*. What Mr. *Webster* seems to Dislike, is, that we must Accept of Christ and his Righteousness, for Sanctification, before we be Justified, and that also we must Purpose and Engage in the Strength of Christ, to study sincere Obedience to the Whole Law before we be Pardoned or Justified; Which, I know, does not agree with an Opinion, Mr. *Webster* once told me, he Maintained; Namely, that a Person is Justified before he be Regenerated; Which goes pretty far the *Antinomian* Way: And if that were True, then, I think, neither Accepting of Christ for Sanctification, nor Engaging in his Strength to Study New Obedience, nor Repentance unto Life, could Preceed Justification; For, an Unregenerat Soul is Capable of none of these, and, I think, is likewise, as Uncapable of Exercising Justifying Faith. However, my Opinion is the same with Dr. *Owen's*, who thinks it Impossible, that Justifying Faith should be without a sincere Purpose of Heart to Obey GOD in all things, seeing it is the Gift of GOD, and is a Principle of Spiritual Life which, in the Habit of it, as Resident in the Heart, is not really Distinguished from that of all other Grace whereby we live to GOD, Pages 140. 141. And as to Repentance, which some Affirm to be of the same Necessity to Justification that Faith

is, th
to p
with
but,
their
Distin
penta
Neces
he fo
Teach
don
3. 19
tell ye
perish
Teach
I. an
on Ef
fectu
of it
of it
ficati
whom
fieth
ing I
where
Sinne
IF
tion,
tures,
chisms
ed b
by M
of the
I N

is, the Doctor says, But that which they have to prove is, not *that it is of the same Necessity with Faith, unto them that are to be Justified*; but, *that it is of the same use with Faith in their Justification*, Page 142. Where he Judiciously Distinguishes between the use of Faith and Repentance in Justification, tho' he Grants *both are Necessarily preredquired to Justification*: In which he follows the Doctrine of the Scriptures, which Teach, *that Repentance unto Life preceeds Pardon or Justification* Isa. 55. 7. Acts 2. 38. and 3. 19. and Luke 13. 3. 5. where says Our LORD, *I tell you nay, but except ye Repent ye shall all likewise perish*. And Our Confession of Faith and Catechisms Teach the same Scripture Doctrine Chap. 10. §. 1. and in the Parallel Questions in the Catechisms, on Effectual Calling, the first Part of which Effectual Calling is Regeneration; the second Part of it Repentance unto Life, and the last Part of it Justifying Faith, all which preceed Justification as appears by Chap. 11. §. 1. 2. *Those whom GOD Effectually Calleth he also Freely Justifieth &c.* and also from Chap. 15. §. 1. 2. Describing Repentance unto Life, Compared with §. 3. where it is said, *that it is of such Necessity to all Sinners, that none, may expect Pardon without it.*

If Mr. Webster have left that Antinomian Notion, and do now hold the Doctrine of the Scriptures, Summed up in Our Confession and Catechisms on this Head, which is very well Explained by Doctor Owen, in the Places mentioned by Mr. Webster and Me, then He and I will be of the same Mind, about Justifying Faith.

I Might also, were it needful, Cite the Paragraph

graph of My Letter to Mr. *Webster* of February 23. 1713. Where I Maintain the same Doctrine about Justifying and Saving Faith.

I had also Occasion near Two Years since to Express my Mind fully on this Head before this Reverend Presbytery in a Sermon from *Acts* 20. 20. 21. at a special Solemnity in this City, and no Body ever Challenged as Erroneous, any Thing I then Delivered, that I heard of. And truly, Mr. *Webster* is the Only Person, that, to my Knowledge, did ever Accuse me of Error about Faith and Justification.

By what I have said, I hope, the Reverend Presbytery will be Convinced, that this *Article* is False and Calumnious. I Proceed next to the Only *Article* of his Second Class, that Remains Unanswered, which is

E R R O R XI.

MR. *Webster* does here Alledge, I Assert in My Letters to the Deceased Mr. *Rowan*, that there are Two Principles of Divinity, the Scriptures and Our Reason (*a*). And in his Representation, Part 2d Error II (*b*). He says, *For the Relevancy of this, I refer only to the Letters interchanged betwixt Mr. Rowan and Mr. Simson, &c. and says, It is a Blending of Socinianism and Calvinism together. Whether he says Relevancy, in stead of Probation, I Know not.*

Now, to this Charge I Answer 1st, That it is utterly

utterly False, that I say in My Letters to Mr. Roman, or any where else, that there are Two Principles of Theology, Scripture, and Our Reason. For, taking Our Reason, as Mr. Roman and several others do, for the Intellectual Faculty, or its Exercise, or both; as in his Letter to me February 15. 1712. I Deny it to be a Principle of Divinity: Which will be Evident from these Passages of My Letters; Letter of November 21. 1711. I say First, that by Ratio I Understand, Evident Propositions Naturally Revealed; And by Principium or Fundamentum, the Argument by which any Conclusion is Proved; Which is the Just Meaning of these Terms in this Case, when the Question is; Upon what Arguments is Theology Founded or Proved to be True? Where I do not Allow Our Reason, taking it for Our Intellectual Faculty, or its Exercise, to be so much as an Argument, much less the Rule (which is what I Suppose Mr. Webster Means by Principle) of Theology. And in my Letter to Mr. Roman May 1st, 1712. I say, ' That if Ratio be ' taken so, (as you would have it) I Think ' the Proposition you have for mine, (Namely, ' *Ratio est ultimum Principium Theologiæ*) together with your Two Inferences, and the Propositions of Smalcus and Ostorodius to be all Stark Nonsense, as if One should say, that Red Colour is Loud, Green is Warm, Blew is Sweet, or the Like. So that, by what I wrote in my Letters to Mr. Roman, I Think it Nonsense to say, that Our Reason is a Principle of Theology. What I say to him, is, that

that the Ultimat Proof of Theology is made up of Evident Propositions Naturally Revealed. This I Told Mr. *Webster* in the Conference at *Edinburgh*, and do now Own and Maintain, and Challenge him, and all that will take His Part to Prove it False, or Contrary to Scripture, or to Our *Confession* and *Catechisms*.

2ly, If Mr. *Webster* Mean by Our Reason, what I Understand by *Reason*, and take *Theology* in its full Extent to Comprehend both Natural and Revealed Theology; Then I say, there is a Twofold Principle of Theology, *Scripture* and *Reason*, taking Principle for a Rule: And this every Under-graduate (who has Learned his *Pneumaticks* and *Ethicks*, and that is not an *Ignoramus*) doth Know.

Therefore I Conclude, that this *Article* is False, if *Reason* be taken in Mr. *Rowans* Sense; And if *Reason* and *Principle* be taken in the Sense I give of them, I Plead, that the *Article* is Irrelevant.

Answer to *Additional Libel*, *Article IV.*
and *Representation*, Part III. *Error IV.*

I Come now to Answer these *Articles* of his *Additional Libel*, that are different from those Contain'd in his *Principal Libel*, and have not been as yet Answered: The First whereof is this *Fourth Article*, which (a) stands thus; ' *Unica*
' *Anima Humana potest informare diversa & diffita*
' *Corpora*

'Corpora humana, & omnes Vitales & Rationales
'Actiones in iis præstare: Et hac Similitudine
'utitur ad Explicandum Myſterium Trinitatis.
Which in his *Representation*, part 3. (b) runs thus:
'That One Individual Single Soul may Inform
'Divers Bodies, tho' diſtant one from another; and
'in theſe Bodies perform all Vital and Rational
'Actions, and by this *Simile* the Myſtery of the
'Trinity is to be Explained.

To which I Answer, 1^{ſt}. That this *Article*, as
Expresſ'd in his *Libel*, in Latin, is not Mine, but
Mr *Rowans*; And neither it, nor Mr. *Webſters*
Version of it, give a right Idea of my Opinion; And
ſo, what Mr. *Webſter* Calls the *Old Jargon of the*
Schoolmen, lyes not at my Door: Yet, that Ex-
preſſion, *Informare Corpus*, is oft Explain'd by
them in a very Good Senſe, tho' it be Barbarous
Latin. And I would alſo have Mr. *Webſter* to
Notice, that his Calling the Soul, or a Spirit;
the *Form of a Man* (c) is as much School Jarg-
on, as the other Expreſſion: And to ſay, *Anima*
eſt *Forma Hominis*, is as Barbarous Latin as, *Anima*
Informat Corpus. To which I only Add, *Turpe*
eſt *Doctori*, &c.

Mr. *Webſter* Alledges, 'It is Bad Philoſophy;
'to Say, that the Soul Performs all Vital A-
'ctions in the Humane Body; Becauſe, ſays
'he, ſeverals of them Actions are Unknown to
'many Souls, who are altogether Ignorant of
'the Way they are Performed, and are no
'ways Conſcious to themſelves of their Perform-
'ing them: Yea, they are Performed by the Body
R alone

' alone, without the Concurrence of the Soul. (d)

Were it fit for me here, to Debate a Point of Philosophy with Mr. Webster, I might shew him, that this Proposition is False, viz. *That all, or several Vital Actions are Perform'd by the Body alone, without the Concurrence of the Soul.* For, it is Demonstrated, that the Vital Actions of Animals are Performed by an Alternate Motion of Mechanical Powers, which Motion cannot be Continued, according to the Laws of Mechanism, by the Body alone, because it frequently needs New Impulses, at Regular Intervalls, which the Body cannot give; And therefore, they must be given, either by GOD immediatly, or by the Soul United to it, or by some other Intelligent Being: Which last is manifestly Absurd. It has also been Proved, that these Motions of the Body that are Subject to our Wills, are Performed by a Special Determinate Motion of the Animal Spirits in Proper Nerves, when we Move any Member of Our Body, or Walk, or Speak, &c. Now, these Motions of the Animal Spirits, or Nervous Juices are either Produced by the Soul, according to the Particular Bodily Motions, it has Occasion for in the Course of its Life; Or, they are immediatly Produced by God: Which last is the Groundless Fancy of *Malbranch* that is not easily Reconcilable with Reason and Religion, and is Built upon an Absurd Supposition, ' That GOD either Cannot or Will not give to the Human Soul ' Power to Produce these Motions in a due Subjection to His Own Supreme Government.

But if the Soul Produce them, it will be Manifest, that Our Souls Perform many Actions, which most Men know nothing of; and the Best Philosophers have little or no Knowledge of the Manner how Themselves or Others do Perform them, and none are Conscious of their Performing them. And if the Soul give Motion and Direction to the Animal Spirits in these Bodily Motions subject to Our Will, without knowing it, or being Conscious thereof, it may also Produce all Vital Actions, by the same Reason, without being Conscious of its so Doing: And God may Wisely Order it thus to be in our present Imperfect State; *as might be Proved by many Good Reasons, were this a fit Place for it.*

Had Mr. VV. known, that this Proposition, here Advanced by him, was One of the Last Supports of the *Atheists* Cause, which has been Forced from them by Our Later and Present Philosophers, who have Clearly Demonstrated, that *this Shred of Cartesian Tattle* is Contrary to the Establish'd Laws of Motion; I Doubt not, but he would, before this Time, have Rejected with Horror and Indignation this Piece of his Philosophy.

I Answer, 2ly, That Our Divines commonly Yield to the *Socinians*, That among Creatures, the *Essences*, or Intelligent Substances, must Necessarily be Multiplied according to the Number of Persons. Which Concession the *Socinians* do much Boast of, and Use their Utmost Efforts to Employ it against the Doctrine of the Trinity. Now, altho' it be a Good and Solid Answer to this *Socinian* Argument, viz. It is Impossible there

260 *Answers to Additional Libel,*

can be a Plurality of Persons among Creatures, unless there be an Equal Plurality of Essences, or Intelligent Substances; Therefore, there cannot be a Plurality of Divine Persons, unless there be an Equal Plurality of Divine Essences or Substances: I say, tho' it be a good Answer, to Deny this Consequence, yet, we should not grant them the Antecedent, which they make so ill Use of, unless it were Unquestionably True, That it is Impossible for God, to Create Three Persons that have One Common Rational Nature, or Intelligent Substance.

Now, This I do not Think Impossible: For, God can, of His Infinite Wisdom and Power, Create a Spirit suitably Qualifi'd, and Unite it to Three Distinct Human Bodies, so as it may Perform in each of them all these Vital and Rational Actions, that Three Distinct Souls of Men do ordinarily in their Distinct Bodies; And this it may Do with such Variety in their Actions, as is Consistent with their Proceeding from One Rational Soul. In which Case, these Three Bodies, thus Animated and Acted, tho' by One Soul, Producing in them such Vital and Rational Actions, would be justly Esteemed Three Persons. Now, all the Use I make of this Supposition, is, to shew the abovementioned Antecedent to be False, which is commonly Yielded to the *Socinians*, and so to take from them that Handle of Cavilling against the Doctrine of the Trinity.

I Agree with Mr. *Webster*, that all his Suppositions are Impertinent, if what I say could admit them, as the *Simile* also would be, if I Applied it as he Imagines. But, in case God should Create such a Soul, and Unite it to Three Bodies, as I have said, He would also, Doubt-

less, in His Infinite Wisdom, so Order the Circumstances of that Soul and its Three Bodies, as to Admit none of Mr. *Websters* Absurd Suppositions: And, that both these are within the Compass of Infinite Wisdom and Power, I hope, neither Mr. *W.* nor any Body else will Deny. The only Thing he says, that Deserves any Notice, is, *That it cannot be Done without a Multiplication of the Soul, which cannot be Present in Different Places at once.* Now, I Grant him, a Spirit cannot be Present at once in Two or Three Places that may be named, and am of Opinion, that a Spirit is Present only in One Place at a time; But then it is to be Enquired, how Great or Small that Place is.

Perhaps Mr. *Webster* Thinks, that a Spirit can only be Present in an Indivisible Point, and not in any Divisible Part of Space at the same Instant; Were this True, then I Grant, My Supposition is Impossible: For, I am of Opinion, that all Finit Spirits are in a Place, or rather, are Present in a Place, and also Move from one Place to another; But, I Think, they are Present in a Divisible Part of Space; which is as Agreeable to their Simple Immaterial Nature, as being Present in a Point. And, I Think, their Presence in a Divisible Part of Space is Evident, from their Moving Distant Parts of Matter, at the same Instant, and Giving them Different or Opposit Directions; As may be Proved from the Motions given by Our Souls to Several Internal Organs of our Bodies, in the Different Bodily Motions that are Simultaneous and Voluntary. Now, if God can Create a Spirit that can be Present in a Place that is of the Largeness of the Eighth Part of an Inch Square, and can Move Four Bodies, Placed at the Four Sides of that

Square, in a Line Perpendicular to each of its Four Sides, at the Same Instant of Time; In this Case, it is Evident, that the Spirit is Present in a Divisible Part of Space, and does Immediately Exercise its Power of Moving Matter, upon Different Bodies, Distant from One Another by the Eight Part of an Inch; And the Case would be much the same, were they Distant but the Twentieth or Hundredth Part of an Inch: And, if our Souls do Move our Bodies in these Motions that are Subject to our Will, it is Manifest, from the Structure of our Bodily Organs, that it must, at the same Instant, give as Different Determinations of Motion, to Bodies at as great Distance as these I have Mentioned.

Now, if GOD Can Make a Spirit that can Move Bodies Different or Contrary Ways, at the Eight Part of an Inch Distance; no Doubt, by His Infinit Power, He Can Make One, that can Move them at an Inch, a Foot, or a Miles Distance; And therefore, the Place of its Presence must extend as far as the Immediat Exercise of its Power doth Reach, at the same Instant. And therefore, if GOD should Make a Spirit that can Move Four Bodies, placed on the Four Sides or Angles of a Square Mile, Immediately at the same Instant, it behoved to be Immediatly Present in that Whole Space at the same Time; And, a Place of that Extent would be the Place of that Spirit, in which it could Exercise all its Other Faculties, as well as Move Bodies; And so, could Perform Vital and Rational Actions in Three Different Bodies, that kept within the Distance of a Mile Square to one another, which they would certainly do, unless

unless
in w
No
nishes
ter,
ment
born
trary
that
if M
ficien
with
what
Quit
nian
self
have
hum
Web
the
pos
they
of t
Ant
F
Irre
An
T

unless Removed further from one another by Force; in which case, One or Two of them would Die.

Now, I can see Nothing in all this, *that Furnishes Hereticks with Matter of Scorn and Laughter, or, that may Provock them to Deny that Momentuous Doctrine of the Trinity with Greater Stubbornness*, as Mr. Webster Alledges: On the Contrary, I think, it Effectually Wrests from them that Argument whereon they Chiefly Rely. But, if Mr. Webster or any Body else, shall bring Sufficient Arguments to Prove, that it is Inconsistent with the Wisdom and Power of GOD, to Do what, I have Supposed, He Can, then I shall Quite this Answer, and shall Grant to the Socinians the mentioned *Antecedent*, and Satisfy myself with Denying their *Consequence*, as Others have done. But, for any Thing I can yet see, I humbly Conceive, it may pass the Skill of Mr. Webster and all the Socinians and Unitarians in the World, to Prove My Supposition to be Impossible: But, until the Socinians have Proved it, they will have less Reason to Deny Our Doctrine of the *Trinity* with Contempt, than if the Former *Antecedent* were Granted them.

From the Whole, I Conclude, This Article is Irrelevant, and has no Appearance of Error in it.

Answer to *Additional Libel, Article V. and Representation, Part III. Error V.*

THIS Error Mr. Webster does in his *Libel* Express thus (a) *Duplex datur Justificatio*
R 4 *Electorum*

Electorum, Prima est per Fidem in Christum, Ultima vero in Ultimo Judicio erit ex Bonis Operibus, non tamen ex Merito. In his Representation he turns it thus (b) *There is a Twofold Justification of the Elect, One is by Faith in Christ, the Other is at the Day of Judgment, by Our Good Works.* Where it is Obvious, he leaves out, *But not on Account of Our Merit.*

In Both which he gives a very Indistinct and Unfair Representation of My Opinion: Therefore I shall set down the Account of it which I gave him in the Conference at *Edinburgh, August 20. 1713.* He then proposed this

Question, I forgot to ask your Thoughts, Concerning a Twofold Justification; and if you maintain it, in what Sense you understand it?

Ans^r. I do think, there is a Twofold Justification, both of them taken in the Forensic Sense: Some Divines Call the One the Justification of a Sinner, and the Other, the Justification of a Righteous Person. The former is the very same Justification, which the Apostle Teaches *Rom. 3.* and elsewhere, or Justification by Faith, Described in Our *Confession* and *Catechisms*, in which God Absolves the Sinner upon Account of Christs Righteousness Imputed to him and Received by Faith, when he is Accused of the Breach of Gods Law, and therefore to be Punished with Eternal Damnation. The Other is the same with the Justification by Works, Taught by the Apostle *James Chap. 2.* of his *Epist.* when the Believer is supposed to be Accused of Gross Hypocrisie and the want of True

' True Faith, and Holiness required in the Gospel;
 ' In which Case his Good Works are Produced, in
 ' Testimony of the Truth and Sincerity of his Faith,
 ' Love, and Holiness; they being the Native Fruit
 ' and End of that Faith which Works by Love,
 ' and therefore, the Perfection of it, as the Apostle
 ' calls it *verse 22*. Which being Unquestionable
 ' Documents of the Persons Righteousness, he is
 ' Justified or Absolved (from this Charge) and De-
 ' cerned to be Treated as a Righteous Person by
 ' the Sentence of the Judge, whether GOD or Man,
 ' according as he is Supposed to be thus Accused,
 ' either before the One or the Other.

This, I Think, is, what, Mr. Webster says, I
 ought to have Explained so, as not to give Um-
 brage of my Heterodoxy to Him and Others (c);
 For he Speaks in the Plural Number, So as not
 to give US any Umbrage, as he Speaks the
 same Way on the following Error 6th, saying
 WE cannot Restrain OUR SELVES from well
 Founded Apprehensions (d); Where, by the
 Way, I Crave, Mr. Webster may be Obligated to
 Declare, who are his Partners in this Accusation.

But to Return, I Think, I have Explained
 My Mind about this, so Clearly, as to leave no
 Ground for any Umbrage of my Heterodoxy to
 these who have a Competency of Gospel Know-
 ledg and Charity; And what I then said, was
 as full an Answer to his Question, as could, in
 Reason, have been Expected from Me, at that
 Time and Occasion; And if He, or any Body
 else, want to Know more Fully, what is My
 Opinion

Opinion on this Head, they will find it in *Pictet*, *Theolog. Christ. Lib.* 10. *Cap.* 3----7. In which Last Chap. he Explains Clearly and Convincingly the Justification of a Righteous Person spoken of by the *Apostle James*; And shews, how Consistent this Apostles Doctrine is, with that of the *Apostle Paul*, concerning the Justification of a Sinner; Where, I Think, he Clears and Confirms the Ordinary Way of Reconciling these Two Apostles, better than any other I have Read: And the Special Advantage of his Method is, that he Considers these Two Different Justifications, as Proceeding on Different Libels or Accusations, and does not Place the Difference of them in this, that the One is a Justification of the Person and the Other of his Faith, or of his Justification by Faith; Which Last, with *Mr. VWebsters* Good Leave, is a Way of Speaking not to be Found in Scripture, tho' the Thing Meant by it be therein Taught, and is the same in Effect with what *Pictet* says: Only his Explaining it by a Twofold Justification of Our Persons on Two Different Libels gives a Clearer Idea of the Purpose, and is a Way of Speaking that is more Agreeable to Scripture and Law than the other, and as Consistent with Our *Confession* and *Catechisms* as It is; Altho' *Mr. VWebster* may Think otherways: The *Apostle James* Speaks of the Justification of Persons; For he says Expressly, *was not Our Father Abraham Justified by VWorks*, Ver. 21. And *was not Rahab the Harlot Justified by VWorks* v. 25? Yet it is Plain, that it is a quite Different Justification from what the *Apostle Paul* Speaks of, because

because Proceeding upon a quite Different Accusation, from what he Treats of: But in both Cases, the Persons are Supposed to be Accused, and the Persons are Justified. And it is Evident from the Apostle James Discourse, that the Accusation he Speaks of with Respect to Abraham, Rahab, or any other, from which they are Justified by Works, is, *That they are not True Believers, and have no Interest in Christ, and GODs Favour; But are Hypocrites, having only a Counterfeit Dead Faith.* Now, Works, that are the Fruit of Justifying Faith, are the only proper Evidences for Exculpation in this Case, and when Found in the Person thus Accused, they do Prove, *That he is a True Believer, who has that Faith which worketh by Love, and that he is Fruitful in the Works of Righteousness which are through Jesus Christ, to the Praise and Glory of GOD, and therefore he is a Person, who has an Undoubted Interest in Christs Righteousness and whole Purchase; To whom there is no Condemnation according to the Tenor of the Gospel Covenant; And therefore he is Justified or Absolved from this Charge of Unrighteousness, Hypocrisy, want of True Faith, and an Interest in Christ.* And on the Contrary, being Found a Sincere True Believer, the Righteous Judge Determines, that he shall Enjoy the Believers and Righteous Mans Priviledges: And this holds alike whether we Suppose GOD or Man to be Judge, and to pass a Righteous Sentence.

With Respect to the Last Judgement, when every one is to be Judged according to his Works, by Jesus Christ, according to the Gospel; The Libel will be of the

the same Nature with that Just now Mentioned; And the Grand Question to be Cleared in Judgement, with respect to all Adult Persons, at least who have heard the Gospel, will be, Whether they have truly Believed in Christ, and by Faith got an Interest in his Satisfaction and Righteousness, and the Privileges flowing therefrom, particularly the Holiness Required of these to be Admitted to Heaven. In which Case, the proper Evidences to be Adduced are their Works, which, as mentioned before, do prove that they have an Interest in Christ, and in Pardon and Glory through Him, and have the Holiness Required. These Evidences, therefore, being found in all Believers, they are Absolved from all that this Charge Contains, and Consequently from all that the Law of Works can Charge them with, and are Adjudged to the Possession of that Eternal Glory, which they got a Right unto by Faith in Christs Righteousness, and have also thereby been made Meet for Possessing it, the Truth of which has been Publickly and Solemnly Proved in Judgement by their Works: & in this sense only they are Justified by their Works, and in this Sense all the Passages of Scripture are to be understood, which say, that Men are to be Judged according to their Works, or Justified by their Words or Works, as *Mat. 12. 37. By thy Words thou shalt be Justified.* So, on the other Hand, whoever wants these Good Works, and are found to have nothing but Evil Works, they must, according to the Rule of the Gospel, be Condemned; because thereby 'tis Evident, they have no Interest in Christ and his Righteousness &c; and therefore are Liable to the Curse of the Law.

I hope, by this Explication, Mr. Webster and
his

his Fellows may see, there is no Ground of their Intertaining any Umbrage of my Heterodoxy, seeing there is nothing here set up to Rival with Christs Righteousness, in Delivering us from the Curse of the Law, or of Purchasing us a Right unto Eternal Glory or the Possession of it.

But, I must Own, that I have Received some Ground of Umbrage of his Heterodoxy from these Words of his (e): ' Christs most Perfect Righteousness is in all States and Conditions (we can be in at any Time) fully Sufficient for our Justification, because it Answers the most Rigorous Demands of the Law, and hath a Superabundant Plenitude of Merit in it. For tho' what he says of the Sufficiency and Fulness of Christs Merit be very true, yet I think it Evident, that it cannot be Sufficient for a Persons Justification, in all States and Conditions, wherein he can be Supposed to be: For Example, Take a Person who hath Died in Final Impenitency and Unbelief, in this State Christs Perfect Righteousness could not be Sufficient to Justifie him, not because of any Imperfection in His Righteousness, but because the Person has no Interest in it. Take also, for Example, any Unbeliever, while on Earth, tho' an Elect Person, while he Remains in that State of Unbelief, Christs Perfect Righteousness cannot actually Justifie him, because he hath no Interest in it: He must therefore have Saving and Justifying Faith, before Christs Righteousness can Justifie him; Not because Faith does, or can Add any Thing to the Sufficiency of Christs Right-

Righteousness for Justification, but because it is a fit and Rational Mean appointed of God, for our getting an Interest in it for Justification, and so can never be sufficient to Justify a Person, while found Guilty of the Want of that true Faith which works by Love. I wish therefore, Mr. *Webster* would take heed, at least, of speaking in the *Antinomian* Dialect. I Conclude, there is nothing Relevant in this *Article*.

Answer to *Additional Libel*, Articles VI. XIII.

I Proceed to the Following Error VI of his *Additional Libel*, where he Charges me with an Omission in these Words: 'When he was Treating on Christs Imputed Righteousness, he never Asserted, it was a Formal Imputation of the Righteousness it Self, in the Sense that all Orthodox Divines Explain it, and wished, that Our Divines Writing on this Subject had not, or did not, Favour the *Antinomian* Error. (f) And in his *Representation* Part 3d 'The Professor never Explained the Doctrine of Christs Imputed Righteousness in the Orthodox Way and Manner, but spake of it, as if the Orthodox, in their Explications, were Bordering upon *Antinomianism*. (g)

The first Thing I take Notice of, in Answer to this, is, that Mr. *Webster* Alledges, I never Explained the Doctrine of Christs Imputed Righteousness, in the Orthodox Way and Manner. To which

I

I say, this is Absolutely False ; Unless Mr. Webster will Maintain, that the Doctrine of Christs Imputed Righteousness, Contained in our *Confession* and *Catechisms*, and in Professor Marcks Medulla, is not Explained in the Orthodox Way and Manner ; Or else, will Undertake to Prove, that I never Teach these Parts of Our *Confession* and *Catechisms* and of Marcks Medulla, which I Challenge him to do, or be Reputed a Slanderer.

On the Contrary, I Affirm, that I Teach Yearly the Doctrine of Christs Imputed Righteousness, as it is Taught in Our *Confession* and *Catechisms*, and by Professor Marck, from whom I do not at all Differ on this Point, nor from the Other Divines we Esteem Orthodox, whom I have Read.

The 2d Thing, I Notice, is, that Mr. Webster says, *I never Asserted that it was a Formal Imputation of the Righteousness IT SELF, in the Sense that all Orthodox Divines Explain it.*

To which I Answer 1st, That these Words are Ambiguous, and may either Signifie, that the Asserting, that there is a Formal Imputation of Christs Righteousness it self, *is the Sense in which all Orthodox Divines Explain the Imputation of Christs Righteousness*; Or, the Meaning may be, that all Orthodox Divines do not only Assert, that there is a Formal Imputation of Christs Righteousness it self, *but have some Peculiar Sense wherein they Understand this Proposition.* Which of these Two are Mr. Websters Meaning I know not, and therefore shall Answer them both.

As to the Former, it is Notoriously False, that all Orthodox Divines Explain their Sense of the Imputation of Christs Righteousness, by Asserting,
that

that it is a *Formal Imputation of the Righteousness it self*: The Authors of Our *Confession* and *Catechisms* insert in them no such Proposition; yet, Doubtless, they were Orthodox Divines: neither hath Professer Marck or Turretin any such Assertion. But, if Mr. Websters Meaning by *Formal Imputation* be, that it is *the Righteousness of Christ it Self, that is Really or Truly Imputed*, and is the Consideration upon, & for which, we obtain the Pardon of Sin and Acceptance of our Persons with GOD &c. Then this is what I Constantly Teach, tho' I do not know, if I Use the Terms **FORMAL IMPUTATION** and **RIGHTEOUSNESS IT SELF**, which is altogether needless in the Way that I Explain Imputation: For, in my Opinion, Imputation either of Sin or of Righteousness, by a Divine Act, admits of no Distinction: And so, if Christs Righteousness *it Self* be not Imputed, I think, it is not at all Imputed; being of the same Mind with Respect to It, as I have Declared above about the Imputation of Sin. For, what some talk about the Imputation of Christs Righteousness *only in the Effects of it*, if it have any Sense at all, is to say, we receive Benefits by it, or upon Occasion of it, but yet the Imputation *it Self* is really Denied; as Dr. Owen well Observes, on *Justification* P. 253. with whom I fully Agree about the Imputation of Christs Righteousness, and do truly think it very Ridiculous and Absurd to say, that Christs Righteousness *it Self* is not Imputed to us, but only the Effects of it. E. G. To say, that Pardon of Sin is Imputed to us: Neither can this be said of Justification, Adoption, Sanctification, or Eternal Glory; which

which
Now
Mr.
Christ
be a
Thin
the
who
ster
to w
Righ
As
his,
plain
in w
of C
tione
Name
Which
SOC
BAX
must
stand
ALL
Dr.
has
the
Head
A
in hi
to sh
Deny
Confe
For

which all are the Effects of Christs Righteousness. Now, so far as I can Guess, this is it to which Mr. Webster Opposes the Formal Imputation of Christs Righteousness It self, and therefore, if that be all he Means, as I said, I Teach the same Thing, tho' I do not Use his Expressions, as do the Authors of Our Confession &c. mentioned, who do not Use them more than I. If Mr. Webster Mean not this, let him tell the Other Term to which he Opposes *Formal Imputation of the Righteousness it self*.

As to the Other Sense of this Proposition of his, I can say Nothing about it, until he Explain Himself; For I Know no Sense, but One, in which Our Divines Explain the Imputation of Christs Righteousness, which is the same Mentioned in Our Confession, and by the Authors Named above, and many more that I might Add; Which Doctrine I Prove and Defend against SOCINIANS, PAPISTS, ARMINIANS, BAXTERIANS and ANTINOMIANS, and must Own, that I am at a Loss, how to Understand, who they are whom Mr. Webster Calls ALL ORTHODOX DIVINES, unless they be Dr. CRISP and HIS FELLOVVS, seeing he has not Named the ANTINOMIANS among the Other Sects that are Erroneous on this Head, whom He Blames Me for not Refuting.

A 3d Thing I Notice in this Article, is, that in his Representation he says, *There is no Need to shew the Direct Contrariety of the Error of the Denyal of Christs Imputed Righteousness to the Confession of Faith, and both the Catechisms; For 'tis Manifest (g).* S To

To which I Answer, 1st, Mr. *Webster* here Intimates, that I Deny Christs Imputed Righteousness, altho' he hath not the Courage positively to Assert it in Express Words. If this be not his Meaning, and if he would not have it Believed, that I Deny Christs Imputed Righteousness, why does he Insert this in his *Libel*? He might as well have said, *There is no Need to shew, that the Denial of the Divinity, or the Satisfaction of Christ, or of the Existence of GOD, is Contrary to Our Confess. &c.* This Clause therefore of his *Representation*, is either wholly out of the Way, or else it is an Accusing of me, for Denying the Imputation of Christs Righteousness, which I Grant is Contrary to Our *Confess. &c.* I Crave therefore, that Mr. *Webster* may be Obligated to Prove this, or be Censured for so Gross a CALUMNY.

A 4th Thing I Notice, is, what he says in the 13. Article of his *Additional Libel (h)*, which perhaps he Aims at, in the Clause of his *Representation* just now Mentioned. The Words are, 'He doth not Own the Formal Imputation of Christs Active Righteousness, but said, before Robert Strang and William Harvie Merchants in Glasgow, a little before the Ministers Taking the Abjuration, in his own Chamber, that making Christs Active Obedience the Object of Justifying Faith, runs us into Antinomianism.'

To which I Answer, 1st, That it is utterly False, that I do not Own the Formal Imputation of Christs Active Righteousness, if by *For-*

mal

mal Imputation Mr. *VWebster* Understand only a True and Real Imputation of Christs Obedience, in Opposition to these who say, that Christs Righteousness it Self is not Imputed to us, but only the Effects of it, as I said above; And Challenge him to Prove, that I Deny it in this Sense: But if by *Formal Imputation* Mr. *VWebster* Understand such an Imputation of Christs Active Righteousness, as is Taught by Dr. *Crisp* and his Fellows, in this Sense, I Grant, I do not Own it.

2ly. I Remember, that I only Talked once with *VWilliam Harvie* and *Robert Strang* together in my own Chamber on the 13 of June 1712. and have some Confused Remembrance, that *VWilliam Harvie* spake something that I Called *Antinomianism*, but if it was any Thing else I Called so, except his saying, That we were to Prefer GODs Glory to Our Eternal Happiness, and be Content to Part with it on that Account, for which he Alledged the Examples of Moses and Paul, I do not Remember. But

3ly, I utterly Deny, that I said before them, that making Christs Active Obedience the Object of Justifying Faith runs us into Antinomianism; For this is Contrary to my Fixed Opinion, and what I Yearly Teach, which is, That Christs Perfect Obedience and Satisfaction, are the Object of Justifying Faith; Or, which is the same, the Compleat Righteousness of Christ Active and Passive: For I am not of the Opinion of *Piscator*, *VVendelin* &c. And what further Convinces me this is False, is, that *VWilliam Harvie* Misrepresented what I said to him on some other Things;

which perhaps flowed Chiefly from his Ignorance, or Mistake; Yet I Suppose, he Dare not Deny, that he was very Diligent in Spreading, not only through this Town, but other Places what I had said to him, that he Thought Erroneous, and put them in Words of his Own, which made them truly Errors. E. G. *That Man was his Own Chief End; That we should not Pray for Infants Salvation, when we Think they are a Dying*: No Wonder, VVilliam Harvie thus Mistook me, seeing Mr. Webster Mistook me so far, as to Assert and Charge in his Libel, the Contradictory of what I Read to him in the Conference at Edinburgh.

The 5th Thing I Notice is, Mr. Webster says, 'That I Wished, Our Divines, Writing on 'this Subject, had not, or did not Favour the 'Antinomian Error, or said, they were Bordering on Antinomianism.

To which I Answer 1st, That I do sometimes Notice, that some of Our Divines, even of these who do not at all Incline to Antinomianism, are not so Cautious in their Expressions now and then, as could be Wished; as these who say, *The Covenant of Grace is not Mutual*, and especially they who say, *The Gospel is only a Bundle of Absolute Promises, and Contains neither Precepts nor Threatnings*: Which Phrases, however they may be Explained so, as to bear a safe Meaning, yet are very ready to be Mistaken by the Vulgar, especially when they hear it Preached, *That the pressing them to the Study of Holiness in the Strength of Christ, as a Necessary Mean and Condition of Salvation, tho' not of Justification, is Legal Preaching*

ing; The plain Scotch of which, I think, is, *that it is the Preaching up of the Covenant of Works, instead of Preaching the Gospel.* Which Errors, or Erroneous ways of Speaking, are well Opposed by Mr. Rutherford, Survey of Antinom. Chap. 8. and Dr. Owen in his greater Catech. in Answer to that Quest. *What is this New Covenant?* Where he says, 'It is the --- Promise of God made unto all his Elect, fallen in Adam, to give them Jesus Christ, --- with a Restipulation of Faith from them unto this Promise, and New Obedience. Which he Confirms and Proves at Large in his Treatise on the Spirit Book 5 Chap. 3. Where he proves, *the Necessity of Holiness, from the Command of God in the GOSPEL, as well as in the LAW.* I wish, some among us would Carefully Read what he there, and also in the following Chapters, says with great Clearness and Force of Scripture and Reason. I might add also Marck, Turrett. and others, were it needful.

The last Thing I Notice, is, Mr. Websters Cry of the Churches Danger, with his Reflection on me, for Intertaining my Scholars with Things that are not so Edifying as might be wished (i). To which I answer 1st, That we Learn from the Example of a Neighbouring Church, that these are the First and Loudest Cryers out of the CHURCHES DANGER, from whom its Hurt is most to be feared, and especially when their Pretences to ZEAL for it run highest: And I hope, by what I have Answered to this and other Parts of his Libel, it is Manifest, that This CHURCH is in no

S 3

DAN-

DANGER from what I Teach, unless *the Teaching the Doctrine of Our Confess. of Faith, Defending it against Adversaries, Refuting their Errors, and Opposing hurtful Innovations may be thought Dangerous to it.* 2ly, I Grant, that I may be Guilty of Spending some Part of my Time in Teaching what is not to the Greatest Edification of the Students, and have Reason to Mourn over my many Failings in the Discharge of so Weighty a Trust, for which I am very Unequal: Yet, I Suppose, there are Ministers against whom no Process is Commenc'd, who also have Failings in the Management of Their Work, and might Edifie their People more, if they Preached Faith and Repentance, than they can by Publishing Slander in the Pulpit, and Commending one Minister, and Reproaching others with opprobrious Names, and Uttering Things that put Modest People to the Blush, and Censuring even the Commissions of Our General Assemblies, *which are very fit Methods to Cause Divisions and Offences.*

Now, if Zeal for GODs Glory can render these Things, and the like, Good and Acceptable in the Sight of GOD, then *the Zeal of the Jews was Right,* and *the Jesuits Good Intention is a Sound Gospel Principle.*

I Conclude this Article with what he Falsly Charges me with in it.

As I st, *That I do not Explain the Doctrine of Christs Imputed Righteousness in the Orthodox way.*

2ly. *That I Deny the True and Real Imputation of Christs Obedience and Sufferings.*

3ly. *That I say, that making Christs Active Obedience*

bedience the Object of Justifying Faith, runs us into Antinomianism.

These Propositions I Crave Mr. Webster may be Obligated to prove, or be Censured for Slander.

Answer to Additional Libel, Article VII. and Representation Part III. Error VII.

I Proceed to the Following VII Article of his *Additional Libel* in these Words, ' There is no place of Scripture that asserts the Procession of the Holy Ghost from the Son. The Scripture says, that he was sent from the Son, and did Proceed from the Father : So that the *Greek Church* is not to be too much Condemned on this Head (k).

In his *Representation*, part 3d. Error 7. (l) it runs thus. ' He doubts of the Procession of the Holy Ghost from the Son, and will not Condemn the *Greek Church* for the Denial of it.

To which I Answer 1st, That my Opinion is Indistinctly and Imperfectly related in his *Libel*; And he Accuseth me falsely in his *Representation*, when he says, I doubt of the Procession of the Holy Ghost from the Son : And, I Crave he may be Obligated to Prove this.

2ly, I Yearly Teach the Doctrine of Our *Confess. & Catech.* on the Trinity, and do Maintain, that the Holy Ghost Proceeds from the Father and the Son, which is Proved from *John* 15. 26, Where he is said to be sent by the Son, and from *Gal.* 4. 6. where

S 4

he

he is Called *the Spirit of the Son*, of the Truth whereof I have no Doubt.

I Answer 3ly, As to the Opinion of the *Greek Church*, I doubt, whether there be much more than a Verbal Difference between Them and Us : And in speaking of this, I Own, that there is no Place of Scripture, which sayeth expressly, *that the Holy Ghost proceedeth from the Son* ; Which I shall Retract, upon Mr. *Websters* shewing me the Scripture that expressly says, *He proceeds from the Son*. Yet this is not a Sufficient Ground to Deny, that He Proceeds from the Son, seeing other Places of Scripture Teach what is Equivalent thereunto.

And the *Greeks* having Granted in their Debates with the *Latins*, *that the Holy Ghost Proceeded from the Father by, or through the Son* ; I think, it may be Questioned, whether the *Greek Church* really Denied the Proceſſion of the Holy Ghost from the Son or not ; and Conſequentially, whether They Differed from the *Latins* and Us, except in the Way of Speaking. And of this Mind alſo is *Profeſs. Marck, Compend. Theolog. Cap. 5. § II.* ‘ Unde improbanda eſt Græcorum ‘ orientalium opinio de Spiritu procedente a ſolo ‘ Patre, pro qua adverſus Latinos diſputarunt fer- ‘ vide inde a ſeculo Septimo ; licet occaſio litis ‘ ab hiſ, per additionem vocis *FILIOQUE* ad Sym- ‘ bolum *OEcumenicum* *Constantinopolitanum*, non ‘ ineptam quidem, ſed tamen propria autoritate im- ‘ prudenter factam, data eſſe videatur ; ipſaque hiſ ‘ nimio imperio et zelo quoque continuata, cum ‘ in phraſi aliquoties hære viſa fuit, Græcis proceſ- ‘ ſionem a Patre per Filium concedentibus, et con- ‘ junctione Filii cum Patre per eandem phraſin in ‘ Scriptura nullibi reperta. It

It is on this Account that I think, the *Greek Church* is not so much to be Blamed: And I hope, Mr. *Webster*, at least, the *Presbytry*, and Others, will find nothing in all that I here maintain, that is Bold and Dangerous, or that may be Justly said to be Contrary to Our *Confession* and *Catechisms*: Neither is there any Cause, why Mr. *Webster*, or his Fellows, should Tremble at any Consequences, that can Natively follow from what I Teach on this Head. And if any of My Scholars should come to Preach such Things as he Alledges, they would Act Contrary to My Instructions and Example; And if any of them shall ever be found in such Faults, let them be Duely Punished for them. But, I Humbly Conceive, that this Church is, at least, as little in Danger, from the Preaching of My Scholars, as of Mr. *Websters Disciples*; if we Judge by what has hitherto happened.

It seems, he is not too well Acquainted with the History of the Controversy between the *Greeks* and *Latins* on this Head, else he would Know, that the Difference in Opinion, about the Procession of the Holy Ghost, was not the principal Cause of the Divisions and Convulsions that fell in between them, but was rather made a Handle of: To Convince him of which, I desire he may Read *Vossius de Tribus Symbolis* part 3d.

I Conclude, that there is nothing in this Article that I really Teach, that is Relevant; And Crave, Mr. *Webster* may be Obligated to prove what he hath Falsly Alledged.

Answers to *Additional Libel*, Article VIII.
and *Representation*, part III. Error VIII.

‘**M**agistratus Christianus habet plenam potestatem indicendi Synodos, dies Jejuni, Gratiarum actiones, non tamen solam : Ecclesia Magistratu ei inimico vel renitente, potest ea indicare, non autem publice peragere, sed privato modo vel clandestino, si modo prudenter agat (*m*).

In his *Representation* he Alledges, *I give the Magistrate a Vast Exorbitant Power in Sacris.* (*n*)

Answer 1st, I Deny, that I Give to the Magistrate a Vast Exorbitant Power in *Sacris*.

2^{ly}, The Language and Expressions of this Article in his *Libel* are not mine, but Mr. *Rowans* somewhat Corrupted.

3^{dly}, What I Teach about Calling Synods, is the very same Contained in *Confession*, Chap. 31. §. 2. And I give the Magistrate no more Power, than is there said to be his Due; even when Compared with the Act of the Assembly of the Church of *Scotland*, August 27. 1647. And as to Fasts and Thanksgivings, I Ascribe no more Power to the Civil Magistrate, than is done by Act 7. of the *General Assembly* 1710. And I am as far from Thinking, the Magistrate can Lawfully Inroach upon the Intrinsick Power of the Church, as Mr. *Webster* is : Neither do I Teach any thing Contrary to our *Confession*, Chap. 23. §. 3. But Teach the Express Doctrine therein Contained; And if Mr. *Webster*

fter Imagine I do otherwise, I Challenge him to make it Appear. Therefore, I Conclude, that what I Teach on this Article, is my Duty, and that there is nothing deserv'g Censure. I Proceed to the following

Article IX.

E Sus Sanguinis sub Novo Testamento est Illicitus (o). In his Representation (p) it is turned, *He Forbids Eating of Blood.* To which I Answer, that this Article is not Relevant, and Mr. *Websters* Single Observation on it, is Silly and Ridiculous; And if there be in it any Thing at all, it will be Adviseable, that he beware of Reading or Repeating several Passages of Scripture, Except at Convenient Seasons of the Year, and in Certain fit Places of the World, least there be therein Mentioned some Fruits or Meats, that cannot be had in the Season or Place, where these Texts of Scripture are Read or Preached; And thereby the same Fatal Consequences Follow, which he Supposes may Attend My Scholars Preaching this Opinion of mine: But I hope, they may Manage their Preaching so, as to Avoid such Evils as well as he.

Answers to Additional Libel, Article X. and Representation, Part III.

THE Words of his Representation (q) are, 'He says it is Probable, that the Moon, and

‘ and other Planets are Inhabited by Rational
 ‘ Creatures; And here Mr. *Webster* Alledges,
 ‘ That this is a Speculation not very Proper for
 ‘ the Chair of a Professor of Divinity, and that
 ‘ it hath more Danger and Contrariety to the
 ‘ Scripture in it than many Apprehend.

To which I Answer, 1st, I Own, I do Think
 it Probable, that there may be Rational Crea-
 tures Inhabiting the Moon and other Planets.

2^{ly} I Assert, that there is in this Opinion, nei-
 ther Danger nor Contrariety to Scripture, more
 than in Holding, *That the Earth is Round*, and
that there are Antipodes, both which were some-
 time a Day thought Dangerous and Contrary to
 Scripture, the Reason of which every Body knows,
 and is the same in this Case.

3^{ly}, I do not Think it Improper for a Pro-
 fessor of Divinities Chair, seeing such Fam’d
 Professors, as Mr. *Webster* Mentions, have thought
 it Proper both for their Chair and Pen to Oppose
 it. And therefore, it is as Proper for me to Treat
 of it, as it was for them, and I must either
 speak of it one Way or other, or pass that Pa-
 ragraph of *Marcks Book* that I Teach.

4^{ly}, I Think it my Duty, to let my Scholars
 Know, that there is nothing in Scripture that is
 Inconsistent with the True Principles of Natu-
 ral Philosophy, which they are Taught in This,
 and the Other Universities of this Kingdom, where
 ’tis Arrived at a far greater Degree of Perfecti-
 on than in *Holland*; And by what I ever have
 Observed of its Progress, the more we Advance
 in the True Knowledg of Nature, Our Philoso-
 phy Agrees the better with the True Sense of
 Scripture,

Scripture, and is the more Serviceable to True Christian Theology, and the more Confounding to its Adversaries, as this Speculation also is. Wherefore, I Think, I Serve the True Interest of Religion, when I Use my Best Endeavours to Remove these Prejudices and Stumbling Blocks.

Lastly, I Doubt, if Mr Webster will be Forward to Own himself so Ignorant of Philosophy, as to say, It is not Probable the Moon & other Planets are Inhabited by Rational Creatures; and to Declare, it is his fixed Opinion, that what he Charges me with is truly Dangerous, and Contrary to Scripture. So this Article is Irrelevant.

Answer to Additional Libel, Article XI. and Representation, Part III.

IN this he Blames me, for Saying of Professor Marck, *Halucinatur* Author (r): This, says he, (s) is Pride, Insolence and Heterodoxy.

I Answer 1st, That this Charge plainly Proceeds from Mr. Websters Ignorance of the Meaning of the Latin Word *Halucinatur*, which signifies, he Mistakes, or is Mistaken, which, as it is a Civil enough Way of Speaking in Our Language, so every Body that Understands Latin, knows it to be no Rude Way of Testifying Dissent from any Author. Gomarus, doubtless, had Abundance of Respect to Calvin, and was a Well Bred Man, and yet in the forementioned Place of his Exposition of Matth. 20. 26. he Ascribes a *Duplex Halucinatio* to him.

I

I have too Great an Esteem for Professor *Marck*, and too Fresh and Grateful a Remembrance of his Kindness to me, when his Scholar, to allow my Self to Treat him Unhandsomly, tho' I tell my Mind Freely in these Things wherein I Differ from him; which, are Chiefly, if not only, some Philosophical Points, that do not Affect the Substance of his Doctrine.

But Mr. *Webster* must have a good Stock of Confidence, to Accuse me of Rudeness, Pride, Insolence and Heterodoxy, for saying *Halucinatur*, when yet he himself in the very same Article Calls him *Unsound in Point of Church Government*; Which is a Heavy Reflection cast upon him in a very Publick Manner; And I suppose, it will Appear ill Grounded to any Judicious Person, who Reads what he says of Church Government in his *Medulla*; with which if we duly Compare that Passage in his Larger Compend, which seems Disagreeable to Our Principles, and put the most Favourable Construction on it, as we should, it will Amount to no more, but that *the Form of Church Government, which He and We Plead for, is not Essential or Absolutely necessary to Christianity*; Which, I know, is the Way he uses to Explain himself on that Head.

I Conclude, that this Article is not Relevant; And Desire, it may be Noticed, that Mr. *Webster* Discovers more Ill Will to Me, than True Zeal for the Truth, when he makes such Trifles an Article of a *Libel* against me.

Upon the Whole, I Plead, that None of these Propositions Owned by Me, Relating to Any of the Articles of Mr *Websters* Libel, are Contrary to, or Inconsistent with the Confession of Faith of
this

this Church, or the Worship, Discipline, or Government of the same; And, Consequently, that None of these Propositions are Relevant, according to Act 14. General Assembly 1711. Notwithstanding that Several Brethren may Differ from me in Opinion, about the Truth or Usefulness of some of them.

Which Difference can be of No Ill Consequence to the Church, if we Observe the Apostles Rule, *In Forbearing One Another in these Smaller Things wherein we Differ; And Walk by the same Rule, in the Weighty and Necessary Things wherein we are Agreed,* which are well Summ'd up in Our Confession of Faith and Catechisms, and in the Rules of the Worship, Government and Discipline of this Church; And if We Joyn Heartily and Unanimously in the Vigorous Defence of these Gospel Truths, against such as Oppose them; Albeit we should do this by Methods somewhat Different: Which may be more Useful to Attain the End we all Aim at, than if Methods every Way the same were Taken by All.

What I Crave, is, *That Mr. Webster may be Obliged, First, to Prove Me Guilty of Holding and Teaching Socinian Errors; And Next, of Arminian and Other Errors, Contrary to Our Confession of Faith, or the Rules of the Worship, Government, and Discipline of this Church; Which He has, in the Most Publick Manner Laid to My Charge: Wherein if He Succumb, I Crave, That I may be Acquitted, and that Mr. Webster may be Duly Censured as a Gross Calumniator; And so, a Check may be Given to such an Unchristian Practice, of Defaming Ministers of the Gospel and*
Pro-

Answer to Addit. Libel,
 Professors of Divinity, by Raising, Spreading, or
 Publishing False Stories and Slanderous Accusati-
 ons; Which are the *Engines* that Satan has long
 with too Good Success made Use of, to Cause Di-
 visions and Offences in the Church of Christ: And
 from Which this Church is *far more in Danger* at
 Present, and *has more to Fear*, than from All the
 Attempts of its Avowed Enemies.

This Signed at Glasgow, March 28. 1715.

by Me,

Sic Subscribitur,

John Simson.



r, or
fati-
long
Di-
And
r at
the

N.